The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1927 NUMBER 682

Contents

The Week 150

Editorials

Industrial Freedom Assaulted 153
Socratic Liberalism 155

General Articles

Herbert Hoover, Practical Man ..... George Soule 158
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 163
Another Reinhardt ..... Stark Young 164
Præterita ..... Virginia Woolf 165
Company Unionism in Deadly Parallel 166

Correspondence 168

Reviews of Books

The Counterfeiters ..... P. L. 170
Boy in the Wind ..... Helen Goodspeed 171
Sociology: Historical, Applied and Speculative ..... E. C. Lindeman 172
The Bridge of San Luis Rey ..... M. C. 173
Illusive Liberty ..... Paul Jones 174
"For to Behold This World So Wide—" ..... Dorothy Bacon Woolsey 174

The Week

JUST about a year ago the United States was hesitating on the edge, if not of a war with Mexico, at least of a break, which, had it occurred, would have resulted in a revolution in Mexico and a fair chance of ultimate war. But the break was averted, and when the revolt came the Mexican government was strong enough to suppress it. Today Mexico and the United States, instead of being on the verge of war, are expressing with effusion their affection and good will for each other. There is no sufficient alteration in the facts of the relationship between the two countries to account for this alteration in emotional attitude. It has been brought about exclusively by the substitution as the ambassador from this country to Mexico of a man who was sympathetic in the place of a man who was unsympathetic. Mr. Coolidge's appointment of Dwight Morrow as ambassador was assumed to indicate a more conciliatory attitude towards Mexico on the part of the administration, and Mr. Morrow himself had the happy thought of getting Lindbergh to fly to Mexico City as a symbol of the dove of peace and reconciliation. The plan has been a brilliant success. Both governments are exhibiting a change of disposition towards each other which should make it possible for negotiations to iron out the immediate differences. After the Calles government has been not only recognized, but beatified by having the hands of the popular American angel Gabriel laid upon its chief, a long time will elapse before a President of the United States can decently threaten to demote Calles or his successor.

AMERICAN patriots have every reason to be devoutly thankful for this result. The Mexican problem is the worst liability which the foreign policy of the United States presents. It has not been completely neutralized by President Coolidge's happy change of attitude, but the grave dangers which overhung the welfare and the good repute of our country are exorcised for the present. It would have been an appalling and probably an irremediable mistake, if a government which represented what the Calles government represents to Mexico had been overthrown chiefly because of the hostile attitude of the government of the United States. In spite of its faults and mistakes, the Calles government is the standard-bearer of the Mexican national revival, and its destruction, with the connivance of its powerful neighbor, would have meant a generation of enmity between the two peoples. The Mexican government has, during the last few months, encountered a revolutionary protest on the part of the disaffected military chiefs, assisted by some outraged Catholics. It has triumphed, although at a terrible price. Obregon will succeed Calles, and while his policy will differ from that of Calles, he will carry on the Mexican national revival. If the Mexican revolutionary democracy remains in power for another five years, it should have confirmed the loyalty of the agrarian and wage-earning classes, to which it appeals, and built up sufficient popular resistance to the continuing threat of a reactionary counter-revolution.

IT DOES not follow, however, that there is plain sailing ahead for the present regime in Mexico, either in its relations with the Mexican people or in its relations with the United States. It suppressed the recent revolt with a ruthless brutality which must have been the result of overpowering fear, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which always follows and is succeeded by abuse of power. The dependence of Calles upon such methods is a sure indication of the underlying instability of social and political order in Mexico. Manifestly, also, one should not depend too much on good will, as incarnated in Dwight Morrow or in Lindbergh, to get rid of the fundamental causes of dispute between the two countries. Friendly relations between neighboring people are brought about not by amiable sentiments, but by a realistic adjustment of interests. There was an ultimate political truth contained in the advice which Anita Loos' Blonde offered to her friend in saying: "A kiss on the hand makes you feel very, very good, but a diamond bracelet lasts forever." The hand-kissing is over. Both should now consider how much they will pay for the diamond bracelets. There is a serious difference of interest between the United States as an exporter of capital and an importer of raw materials, and Mexico as an undeveloped country which needs capital, but needs even more an industry, a finance and an agriculture under her own control. If the relation between the two governments should become extremely friendly and American capital should pour into Mexico faster than it can be Mexicanized, it is almost certain that the present good feeling would be succeeded by renewed friction and hostility.

THE complete break between Russia and the Nationalist government in China was a natural result of the logic of events. It was hastened, but not caused, by last week's abortive Communist revolution at Canton, which, if the news reports are even 50 percent correct, was suppressed to an accompaniment of the most shocking bloodshed. The Nanking government is now dominated once again by Chiang Kai-shek, who last summer declared war on the Communists. Chiang has been supported chiefly by loans, voluntary or forced, from the Chinese merchants of Shanghai and Nanking. These men are afraid of Communism, and have been paying Chiang in the hope and belief that he would purge the land of the Russians and their Chinese sympathizers. This he is now enabled to do. Whether the rising at Canton ever had any chance of success it is impossible for observers at a distance to say; but in any case, it failed, and those responsible for it have played into Chiang's hand. All diplomatic and commercial relations between Nanking and Moscow are ended. All Russian officials must leave China. Numbers of Russian and Chinese Communists, men and women, have been shot down with a ferocity which, however natural it may seem to an Oriental, fills a Westerner with horror. Probably Communism in China is not extirpated, since rigid measures of this sort usually succeed only in causing a movement to go underground; but at least, it is unlikely to play any important part in Chinese affairs for a long time to come.

IT is ridiculous for Chicherin to pretend, as he does in his official reply to the note severing relations, that since Peking signed the Russian treaty of 1924, repudiation by Nanking is of no importance. Peking is dominated by Chang Tso-lin, who lately arrogated to himself the title, "Generalissimo of the forces against Bolshevism." Russia's hopes were with the South, and they have been shattered. The events of the past week have but completed the catastrophe which began last summer with the emergence of Chiang as Nanking dictator and the flight of Borodin. At least one Russian faction was realistic enough to accept the situation some time ago. In the past few weeks much has been heard about a German-Russian-Japanese alliance, against Western Europe. It may be taken for granted that this alliance is a product of the Russian imagination, and that the talk about it is intended as an offset to the loss of China.

REPARATIONS Agent S. Parker Gilbert has called attention to the most important unanswered question in the Dawes Plan—the question of how large the total sum of reparations is to be. Earlier negotiations on the reparations issue wavered between the attempt to fix a total and the attempt to fix yearly payments without naming a total. Every time the question of the total was raised, the negotiators came to grief because the Allies would never make it low enough to meet the possibilities of payment. On the other hand, it was argued that Germany could never settle down in an effort to pay unless she knew how much she was to be responsible for in all. The Dawes Plan, working out a practical method of determining and controlling German contributions for a term of years, left open the difficult question of the total amount. It is now becoming necessary, however, to answer this question because, if it is not answered, nobody will know how good German credit is in the market for private loans. Furthermore, the question is becoming easier to answer as it is demonstrated how much Germany can pay across her frontiers annually by way of interest or amortization. The inference is plain that events are shaping themselves toward a final settlement through a foreign loan to Germany, based on her present capacity to pay. Undoubtedly, when this is decided, settlement of the Allied debts to the United States will be revised. Thus we approach something like the plan recently advocated by Mr. Levinson in the New Republic.

THE naval program submitted to Congress is, practically, the billion-dollar one predicted last week. The plan, which has the approval of President Coolidge, calls for new building in five years to an extent of $725,000,000—twenty-five cruisers, nine destroyer leaders, thirty-two submarines and five aircraft carriers. It omits necessary maintenance items of $80,000,000 more, as well as new battleships, to a value of $148,000,000, which the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experts are eager to get. It is impossible to believe that the fantastic sum indicated is needed, as the naval men insist, merely to "round out" the Navy so as to permit it adequately to perform its police duties in time of peace. While our present cruiser fleet is far inferior to Great Britain's, there is no suggestion that it cannot do all that it is asked to. What the naval men are certainly thinking of, despite all their denials, is a war in which the British and Americans will not be allies. This does not necessarily mean that they will be enemies. We might have a repetition of the case of 1914-1917, when the British navy seriously impaired our rights as a neutral, and made the freedom of the seas a meaningless phrase. The situation was saved then by America's joining the War; but it might turn out differently on another occasion. The conflict of interest is real, and of great importance. It must be solved, and not primarily by the naval men. As long as they remain in control, we shall have an incessant demand for "parity" which really means "superiority," and the armament race will again be in full swing.

THE story of the Hearst press and the Mexican documents is one to make every newspaper man hang his head in shame. Quite aside from the moral issue, the sheer incompetence with which Hearst handled his story is appalling. The papers were bought for $15,000 or $16,000 from a notorious professional spy of Mexico City, long known to be engaged in just this sort of shady business. Mr. Hearst and his underlings must be the only journalists on earth who did not know that the manufacture of such documents is a long-established business. Not one of the ordinary precautions of competent publishing was taken. No effort was made to verify the statements from other sources, and there is not an iota of such verification. Gross blunders in Spanish were noted, but ignored on the theory that government secretaries in Mexico probably wouldn't know any better. An abortive attempt was made to have President Coolidge and Secretary Kellogg read them, obviously in the hope of lending additional weight. Finally, after long thought, it was decided that the man from whom the documents had been bought should get into the Mexican Consulate in New York under false pretenses, and there seek to obtain further documents in corroboration of himself! Even this precious scheme was abandoned. Mr. Hearst still insists that he believes in his famous documents, but if so, he must be the only man who does. He stated on the witness stand that he did not believe the story that $1,200,000 had been paid to Senators Borah, Norris, La Follette and Heflin. Yet he printed it, omitting the names to avoid a libel suit, but well aware that the men he indirectly accused would be named in the subsequent investigation. Mr. Hearst's conduct is sufficiently characterized in the open letter of Senator Norris, the most terrible arraignment of one public man by another in this generation.

THE hospital to which the victims of the Colorado mine shooting were sent has refused, we understand, further treatment for two of these unfortunates unless cash payment is made. Meanwhile, thousands of striking miners and their families are freezing and undernourished, in this holiday weather, not only in Colorado but in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Because they are sufferers from industrial warfare rather than from international hostilities, they receive no help from the Red Cross; no government sends a Hoover to relieve them. Contributions might, of course, strengthen their resistance to the policy of anti-union employers; starvation, freezing and sometimes bullets are considered legitimate weapons in the fight against labor, the effectiveness of which might be destroyed by humanitarian considerations. Public agencies must not, of course, be so "partisan." Yet those who do not share this view have an opportunity to help the suffering by sending contributions to the Emergency Committee for Miners' Relief, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

WE are accustomed to think that the workers resent the machine, while employers, to increase production and reduce costs, strive to do away with handicrafts. A strike of neckwear workers proves that it is not so with neckties. Curiously enough, the more a man pays for his neckties, the more likely he is to have sweated labor around his neck. Let him be content with a dollar- or two-dollar tie and he may rest assured that it has been machine-made in a clean, bright, sanitary loft building at union hours and union rates of wages. But if his girl friend or fond mamma follows that impulse and sends him a five- or ten-dollar tie for Christmas, it is probable that the woman who finished it by hand did so in a city flat and under conditions in no way comparable to those in the factory: also, and here is perhaps the nub of the controversy, the hand-worker was paid about one-fifth the weekly sum received by the speedy machine operator.

STUDENTS at Vassar and Yale who want to investigate at first hand this peculiar twist of modern economics have the opportunity to do so. Last September one hundred and twenty men's neckwear manufacturers signed an agreement with the Neckwear Makers' Union by which home work in New York City was to be done away with inside of eighteen months. New York is the center of the trade for the whole country. Four manufacturers refused to sign and moved their cutting plants to New Haven and Poughkeepsie. About 400 workers were called out on strike; relays of these have been picketing the plants in these cities, seeking to bring the American-born local workers out with them or to force the employer to pay the union rates for ties cut in these factories and sent back

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the tenements of New York to be "slip-stitched" and lined by hand. To meet the manufacturers' claim that women home-makers need this work, the union has coöperated in establishing a shop where only hand-workers are employed, sometimes on part time, and, of course, at union piece rates. For the women with little children or aged dependents who cannot leave the home, the union has offered to inspect apartments to see that the sanitary conditions are complied with, provided, again, that the workers are paid the union scale for slip-stitching, and that children are not pressed into the work. This, because the present labor code provides only for the inspection and licensing of the *tenement house*, not of the individual apartment. The students may learn more of these things by visiting the picket-lines; they cannot do so, at least in New Haven, by reading the local papers, which are maintaining a barrage of heavy silence about the strike.

HENRY L. Stimson is about as good a choice for Governor General of the Philippines as was to be expected. He is honest, a competent administrator, and takes the post at a heavy personal sacrifice. The narrowness of view which marked his recent Nicaraguan mission will not be such a handicap in the Islands as it was in the Central American republic. He is opposed to Philippine independence, at least until some indefinite date in the distant future: but so is Mr. Coolidge, and it is just as well that no false hopes should be raised through the exhibition of a liberalism at Manila which is not reflected at Washington.

THE Massachusetts Civic Alliance, of Boston, is proud and happy as it reviews the results of its recent labors. A short time ago, there were fourteen states which did not use capital punishment. Now there are but eight. This glorious achievement the Alliance claims as its own. It proposes to continue its good work until every commonwealth puts criminals to death, and the United States takes its place, in this regard, among the most backward nations of the earth. The organization opposes laws giving a judge the power to substitute life imprisonment for death, at his discretion, in cases where the jury does not specify. Imprisonment is dangerous, says the Alliance, for "recently three convicts killed the Warden of the New York Tombs Prison and six convicts slew the Warden of the Illinois Penitentiary in their efforts to escape." Moreover, "solitary confinement means death deferred and causes insanity. It is more cruel than the one merciful stroke which immediately surrenders the offender against the Divine image in man to his Judge." Opponents of capital punishment, the Alliance notes with regret, say it is revenge. "It is rather vindication of justice, a commonwealth's noblest act." It has religious value, too. "Experienced prison chaplains have found that respite or commutation breaks up the religious impressions."

Industrial Freedom Assaulted

THE annals of American labor have seldom recorded, and may not for a long time to come record, a more significant legal struggle than that now being waged between the Interborough Rapid Transit Company in New York on the one hand, and the American Federation of Labor and the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees on the other. It is not without precedent that the case concerns an application for an injunction, or that the employer has set up a "company union," or that he has made individual contracts with his employees (commonly called "yellow-dog contracts"). What is new is that these several anti-labor measures have been brought together in such a way, and carried to such an extreme, as to constitute an unprecedented attack on the workers' industrial freedom. This challenge has interested distinguished legal scholars in the unions' cause, and has led to a nation-wide coöperation of economists and social scientists in the preparation of a case which seeks to present to the courts, not merely legal technicalities, but a realistic view of the important questions of public policy involved in collective bargaining, the status of the worker in modern industrial society, and the functions of the labor movement.

The Interborough, some years ago, broke off relations with the regular traction union—the Amalgamated Association—and formed its own "Brotherhood of Interborough Rapid Transit Company Employees." The forms of this "organization," and of its so-called "contract" with the employer, were literally handed down by the company's officials. Every employee, to retain his job, was compelled to subscribe to these documents, and no new men could be employed unless they did so. The preamble to the constitution sets forth that it shall be "deemed to be a contract between the Brotherhood and each of its members individually and the Interborough Rapid Transit Company." The work contract, which each employee is compelled to sign, contains a clause forbidding employees to be affiliated with the Amalgamated Association or any other labor organization, and binds them to work for the company for two years. The company is now asking for an injunction to prevent the whole American Federation of Labor and each of its affiliated members, as well as the Amalgamated Association and its members, from trying in any way to organize its employees, on the ground that such action is an attempt to induce breach of contract. There is no strike in progress, and none is in prospect.

Obviously, if the courts can be induced to intervene in support of this policy and contract, the way is open for every employer, if he so wishes, to enlist the police power of the state in an attempt to destroy the independent organized labor movement by preventing it from keeping or solic-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lting membership. This effort could be carried on regardless of whether there was any attempt to bring about a strike and so to injure the employer, and regardless of the conduct of a strike—the two most common occasions for anti-labor injunctions. Such an outcome naturally would have a debasing influence on the status of the employees, as well as on the labor movement as a whole.

The plea for the injunction might be denied by the courts on one or more of several grounds. The "contract" may be shown to be not a genuine contract involving a meeting of the minds of persons free to act, and offering adequate consideration on both sides. Or, if it is a valid contract, it may be marked by inequality of bargaining power such that certain of its provisions may be invalidated on the ground of public policy. Or, again, the labor movement may be justified, on grounds of public policy or in its own defense, in acting in such a way as might lead to a breach of the contract. A wide array of argument can be brought to bear through these legal embrasures.

There is, first, a mass of impressive affidavits and expert citations on the necessity of unions independent of the employer and affiliated with each other, in order to furnish the employee with true representation in the making of contracts, something like equality of bargaining power in setting wages, hours, and conditions of work, and finally, an organ of expression in the general community life, capable of assuring him information, legal defense, political independence and services of many kinds.

There is a detailed examination of the origin of the company Brotherhood, and of its nature as shown in its constitution, as compared with a genuine union like the Amalgamated Association. We have summarized this comparison on page 166 of this issue. The constitution of the Brotherhood gives no evidence of having been framed or adopted by any representative assembly at any specific time. The fact that the employer had a controlling hand in its framing is shown by the clauses which state that it constitutes a contract with the employer, and that amendments to it were ratified by the Board of Directors of the Interborough. It would, for example, be absurd for purchasers of electric current who had formed an association for dealing with a power company to state, in the constitution of that association, that the document was a contract with the company, binding them collectively and individually. Another absurdity is the constitutional provision that all employees of the company shall become members of the Brotherhood. Why such a provision in the fundamental law of a supposedly voluntary association? If the constitution means anything, then, it means that the Brotherhood is an agency of the employer.

Equally ridiculous and self-contradictory is that this Brotherhood, ostensibly formed for *collective* bargaining, has a constitutional provision compelling its members to sign *individual* contracts with the employer. No real union would permit such a thing, and the provision gives evidence that the company has no confidence in the Brotherhood as a genuine representative of the employees. Further comparisons show the centralized structure and undemocratic procedure of the Brotherhood, whose General Committee has the power to settle disputes without reference to the membership, and the power to expel members (and hence to discharge them from employment) without appeal.

Do employees, forced to sign such a ready-made document for fear of losing or not receiving jobs, join a genuine representative body capable of contracting for them? Have they, as individuals, bargaining power equal to that of the employer? Scarcely. And the result is shown in the work contract which the "Brotherhood" has made and they are forced to sign, an analysis of which we print on page 167. Like other contracts aimed against unionism, it binds the men individually not to join any labor organization, thus depriving them of the advantages which the great majority of students say is necessary to give employees adequate bargaining power and independence in modern industrial society. Such contracts, however, usually have no definite term; they are, as the law says, "at will," and have, therefore, a dubious effectiveness. This contract, apparently for the sake of greater legal security, is unique in binding the men not only to this promise, but to work for the employer, for a period of two years.

But what does the employee secure in return? A promise by his employer not to join any association of employers? No. A promise to employ him for two years? Yes—but a promise modified by clauses safeguarding the right to discharge him for any reason on account of which an employer might ever want to discharge an employee. By strict interpretation of the contract, the employee could not quit even to become President of the United States or to enjoy an inherited fortune, while the employer can discharge him if business is bad or for virtually any other reason. To be sure, the contract provides for some appeal through arbitration machinery, but this does not apply in several causes of discharge, and, even where it does apply, is used only to determine whether the assigned cause is present. As a matter of practice, men are sometimes discharged, without the company's incurring any inquiry, by the simple expedient of expulsion from the Brotherhood by its General Committee. This same General Committee can, without reference to the membership, extend the term of the contract indefinitely. Thus the men are bound much as indentured servants of the colonial period were bound, but for a possibly perpetual servitude, and though the employer assumes none of the obligations of the old master. How does such a revival of the old master-and-servant relationship look, in contrast with the supposed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

freedom of the employer-employee relationship, in contrast with "freedom of contract," "freedom of association" and "equality of opportunity" for education, self-advancement, and participation in social duties and responsibilities?

The company alleges that the contract with the company union assures it the "coöperation" of the employees in the interest of public service, meaning, apparently, that it is a protection against strikes. The unions show, in reply, that strikes have been more frequent under the contract with the Brotherhood than under previous relationships with the Amalgamated Association. They show that, under the constitution of the Amalgamated, a strike may not be called unless the employer refuses to arbitrate. They further show that genuine group coöperation between a union and a management cannot take place unless the men's organization is independent and so free either to coöperate or not to coöperate, and that under these conditions coöperation has extended to a degree undreamed of by the Interborough, as with the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and the shop unions. Real coöperation is not dragooned subservience, but a joint effort, educational in essence, to give better service, on a basis of mutuality. The affidavits on the subject of union-management coöperation alone would constitute a textbook on this development of industrial relations.

There is a presumption that "yellow-dog" contracts, of the general type involved in this case, are not *bona-fide* attempts to bring about harmonious relationships on the basis of agreement, but are drawn with the purpose of securing the aid of the courts in controversies with labor. Any contract should be mainly self-enforcing through the interest of the parties, and should depend as little as possible on intervention of the police power. This is particularly true of collective labor contracts directly involving thousands of individuals. Should the courts, in the public interest, assume the burden which anti-union employers seek to put upon them in this respect? Should they place their prestige squarely in the path of the development of the historic labor movement, which is a response to much the same conditions, using much the same methods, in every industrial nation?

Because in this case the company union has been combined with the individual contract in an effort to circumvent genuine unionism, the hollowness of both is shown in the clearest of lights. It is significant that a bitterly anti-union employer should seize with one hand what is supposed to be a new form of collective bargaining, and with the other what is an attempt to enforce the antithetical individual bargain, and strive to weld them into a monstrous whole. It is significant that the extreme form of both which is the product should so obviously impose industrial servitude on the workers. The occasion furnishes the opportunity for a broad defense of unionism in well-nigh all of its aspects, and for a new consideration of the status of the worker. If the law is to allow him scope for real freedom, real opportunity, real responsibility, it will have to look behind the phrases which originated in a day of simpler relationship, untangle the web of logical deceit woven by skillful attorneys in the interest of reactionary employers, and make a real attempt to adjust precedent to modern social needs. It is fortunate that the case is being presented in such a way as to allow the courts to do this. If they seize the opportunity, a bench mark will have been set in the law for a firmer status of labor and a broader opportunity to seek its fulfillment.

Socratic Liberalism

THE discussion between the New Republic and its readers as to the meaning and mission of liberalism continues to provoke such lively and varied responses from them that we are tempted, even at the risk of boring the unconvinced or the over-convinced, to continue it. The batch of letters which we publish elsewhere carries the argument a step further. They are provocative, but, unlike many of the previous letters, they are also sympathetic. They provide a tempting opportunity of feeling our way in their company toward a better understanding of what it should and should not mean to be a liberal.

One of these correspondents, Mr. Henry Carey, proposes, for instance, to define a liberal as a person in whom belief and judgment dance attendance on evidence. His definition questions the title to the name of liberal of many workers in the vineyard of the Lord who are supposed to earn it by zealously promoting some particular program of political reform or social betterment. The proposed test would consider not the nature of their beliefs or the public purposes which they were trying to accomplish, but the quality of their mental processes. If their prepossession with their own ideas or plans closed their minds to the recognition of new insights and facts, they should cease to be classified as liberals. The opposite of liberalism is not conservatism in politics and social economy. It is narrowness or inertia of thought and complacency of spirit.

It is desirable to dissociate liberalism, as Mr. Carey has done, from a zealous but uninquisitive devotion to particular formulas and programs. His proposed definition looks in a better direction, in that it would require of liberals a mental discipline which would save them from many subjective delusions and headstrong mistakes. But it has a limitation of its own. It assumes that liberalism is a matter exclusively of intellectual activity. There are many people who are perfectly willing to discard or revise their beliefs or their projects in the light of facts, but whose corrected judgments and well behaved plans lack the emotional energy to get themselves

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realized. In a world which is accustomed to giving reality to a formula or a project by proclaiming its truth in the arena of opinion, by fighting for it against all comers and by winning a victory on its behalf, a mental discipline which emphasizes persistent inquiry and revision of judgment may seem to lack power.

Life is primarily a matter of action. Human beings must follow certain patterns of behavior in order to live. In so far as they are civilized, they depend less on instinct, habit and custom, and seek for trustworthy understanding as a guide to action. But even the most civilized and liberated communities cannot dispose of trustworthy knowledge in relation to some of the most indispensable activities of life. Particularly when people wish to provide for their own ultimate welfare and the welfare of society, their verifiable knowledge does not furnish them with the assurance which devoted and heroic action requires. Their noblest and most salutary enterprises are emasculated if they persist in being inquisitive about the worth of what they are doing. Their aspirations cry for some immediate and whole-souled effort at realization. If they ignore this call, they feel shabby and disloyal. Yet if they answer it, they have to act with only a flickering torch of knowledge to illuminate their path. In order to reassure themselves, they pretend to a knowledge which they do not possess, and for the same reason they have to disqualify, ignore or suppress anybody who "wants to know" how far their pretended knowledge is trustworthy. In such cases the very absence of reasonable assurance is, of course, the sufficient excuse for cultivating unreasonable emotional assurance. The Communist, the Fascist or the die-hard is either a fanatic or a failure.

To meet this objection the inquisitive liberal will, we believe, have to shift his ground somewhat. He cannot sacrifice his curiosity to blind zeal or passion, but passion, as so many religious teachers have testified, is not necessarily blind. He may inquire, consequently, whether his search for salutary truth is not capable of generating as much zeal in a properly prepared mind as the cause of the revolution now does in the mind of the Communist. In pursuing this inquiry, he will need to consider with some circumspection why liberals, as compared to more single-track minds, may fail to generate a sufficient emotional drive. May not the failure be traceable, less to some incompatibility between an unscrupulous inquisitiveness and a passionate fixation of the will, than to the limitation of the proposed theories or projects liberals have usually tried to verify or realize? These theories were themselves arbitrary and accidental. Their authors could generate emotional assurance only as the result of their willful assertion. The characteristic liberal experiments have concerned the operation of certain plans for the better government of society, beginning with *laissez-faire* and going on through an extension of the suffrage, to such projects as social insurance. These plans were, however, themselves questionable. Entirely different plans might have been as well worth trying. The zeal which they aroused was generated, not by any necessary association between them and the effort to liberate mankind through increasing understanding, but by the extent of the abuses which they were intended to eradicate and by the violence of the opposition.

On the other hand, the liberals who propose to be unscrupulously inquisitive are acting upon an hypothesis which they at least cannot question. Their curiosity itself is tantamount to faith, and takes on the dignity of an essential affirmation. By acting on it they will, if it works, recruit a kind of understanding and experience which will differ fundamentally from any possible experience of the way in which democracy or social insurance works. Instead of staking their hopes of human liberation upon an increasing knowledge of the operation of arbitrary political and social projects, these new-style liberals would experiment with their own ability to live at once dangerously, inquisitively and faithfully. They would derive their certitude from the knowledge that there was no reasonable escape from such an experiment. An increased understanding of themselves, obtained by a significant experiment, had become a condition of their increased knowledge of nature and society.

Critics of liberalism who consider thorough-going intellectual curiosity incompatible with emotional energy are proposing a theory about the relation between the intelligence and the will which may or may not be true, but which can only be tested by action on that assumption. The only way also to vindicate the opposite belief in the possible liberating effect of thorough-going curiosity is to behave as if it were true. The liberal, in spite of any faith which he may have in creative intelligence, is obliged, like all animals, to act first, and his actions are, in most instances, a matter of animal and social necessity or economy, but, by always acting as an inquirer, he affirms an inevitable association between action and inquiry, between life and consciousness. At the same time, he denies in effect the reality of an alleged psychological fatality which condemns inveterately inquisitive people to emotional anemia. Like previous liberals, he is, of course, the protagonist of freedom. But the liberation which he is vindicating is no longer primarily political or civil: it is personal.

Few, however, even of the thoroughly inquisitive liberals have divined that, if they are to undertake the work of liberating mankind, they must occupy themselves more consciously with the work of self-liberation. Those who do realize it usually appeal, as Mr. Edward C. Wilson does in another column, to education for a remedy. This is all very well, but it is somewhat misleading. Modern education is, to be sure, gradually concentrating on the problem of individual liberation, but, quite properly, it is preoccupied with the problems of childhood and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth, and it is not paying much attention as yet to the problem of adult education, which is what we are concerned with here. Nor is it sufficiently understood that adult education is self-education and is, after a fashion, religious education. Until recently the only organized agency of adult education has been the Christian Churches. They performed the work with some success during the period of puritan conflict, but they have been slipping for the last two hundred and fifty years, and at present they are slipping fast. Laymen, equipped with an essentially non-Christian culture, are taking hold of adult education and are depriving the clergy of their historic function. The Christian Churches, both fundamentalist and modernist, look helplessly on. The fundamentalists purchase certitude by unenlightenment, and the modernists are satisfied with a kind of enlightenment which shares the traditional faults of lay liberalism. It is eclectic and reformist, but the eclecticism lacks integrity and the reformism an outlook toward self-liberation and a method of attaining it.

According to another of our correspondents, Mr. Read Bain, the only faith which can integrate the lives of realistic liberals and serve, consequently, as the starting point of adult education, is faith in the method of science. Those who agree with him will have to ask what, in this connection, is the method of science. How can scientific method help the inquisitive liberal to obtain the trustworthy self-knowledge without which the effort at self-liberation will continue to be the most tragic of all human comedies? Is not the very essence of scientific method the elimination of the personal equation? And how can a liberal who is seeking self-fulfillment by a revival of the old Pythagorean, Socratic and puritan search for self-knowledge eliminate the personal equation? If he did succeed in his work of purgation, he certainly would be emptying out the baby with the bath. But if he refuses to try, what becomes of his scientific objectivity? His self-knowledge would either omit himself or he would vitiate it by the self-delusions which flourish so luxuriantly in the soil of human self-consciousness.

The alternative looks hopeless, but, like other ugly alternatives, it must be grasped rather than avoided. Suppose that a liberal, dedicated to the work of self-liberation, refused to abandon the hope that by a methodical scientific search he could discover some trustworthy knowledge about himself. According to his own lights, of course, he would have to begin by dismissing as untrustworthy all the illusory interpretations of himself which he carries around with him in transacting the ordinary business of life. Since he himself is the only being with access to his own mind, he would have to substitute for these delusions an insight into himself which could be obtained only from self-inspection, but if this self-observation were to bear any relation to scientific method, it would have to be extremely censorious. The observer would have to confine his observations to his psycho-physical organism as a mechanism of behavior, whose responses were automatically determined, as in the case of an animal, by a combination of external and internal conditions. He would separate, that is, his psycho-physical mechanism from himself in order to observe it objectively. He would disidentify himself from it, while at the same time forcing upon himself, so far as he could, an awareness of its actual processes. By splitting his personality in this way, he would be doing something to himself analogous to what science has, during the last three hundred years, been doing to the world. Science has learned a great deal about the world by tentatively disentangling it from God and by observing it as a mechanism which did not need a God to explain its behavior. May not the individual who is possessed by scientific curiosity to learn something trustworthy about himself give reality to his quest by assuming for the moment that he does not need a God of self in the car of his personality in order to explain his behavior?

A liberal who answers the foregoing question in the affirmative may be carried by the impulse of his own inquiry a good deal further. Men have learned how to control natural processes and have enormously increased their power over their surroundings by supposing nature to be a mechanism. If they can increase their knowledge of themselves by supposing for purposes of observation their personalities to be a mechanism of behavior, may they not by some consequent improvement in the technique of living, based upon this improved self-knowledge, substantially increase their own self-control? In the case of nature, the final result of its hypothetical mechanization has not been to divide the universe against itself but to indicate ways compatible with science of finally synthesizing God with nature. So the hypothetical separation by the individual of himself as an observer from the accidents and the compulsions of his actualized personality, and his systematic effort to be aware of how this personality behaves, may prove to be the indispensable route to liberated and reunited consciousness of self.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1927, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
GEORGE SOULE EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

ASSISTANT EDITOR: T. S. MATTHEWS

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN GILBERT SELDES
ELINOR WYLIE LEO WOLMAN LEWIS MUMFORD

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Herbert Hoover, Practical Man

I

HERBERT HOOVER'S praises have been sung so many times that the refrain is like a popular hit of a past season. The catch has gone out of it. The Quaker who, when nearly everyone else was fighting or spoiling for a fight, dedicated himself to the relief of Belgium; the engineer who went into public service, first in the difficult role of war food-administrator, then as Secretary of Commerce; the champion of waste elimination—this Hoover, once so freshly appealing, is now taken so for granted that when he is called for emergency relief wherever there is relief to be directed, whether in Louisiana or Vermont, nobody takes any more notice than when the motorized fire-truck rolls out of the station at the sound of the alarm. People are now thinking of Mr. Hoover, when they think of him, as a possible President. "President Hoover." What sort of associations would that be likely to call to mind, four years hence?

It would be unfair, in making a critical examination of these new possibilities, not to begin with an enlivened memory of those past services. There are a few sincere and competent persons who are, without qualification, opposed to Hoover. But most of those who find fault with him, and whose judgment is worthy of respect, qualify their dispraise by saying that, in view of his obvious qualities, he is to be preferred to any other candidate who has a chance for the Republican nomination. In any race of the availables for the approval of forward-looking people, Mr. Hoover would leave Mr. Coolidge floundering at the mark. He would pass Mr. Dawes going around the other way. Mr. Lowden, with so many farmers for him, would make a better showing, but Mr. Hoover would probably pass him in the stretch. Mr. Hughes, honest and respectable though he is, would be too cold to offer serious competition.

Remembering, then, that we are not setting up as a standard for Mr. Hoover any other individual, or even merely an undefined perfection, it is worth inquiring into the complaints that are made against him, not so much to sit in judgment on him, to find out whether he is politically angel or devil, as to see what they may tell us about his character and direction. They may furnish the shadows for the portrait.

II

First, both historically and in political importance, are the complaints of farmers and their representatives. During the War, the price of wheat was limited, at the minimum, to two dollars a bushel, by act of Congress. It was not permitted to rise far above this minimum, by virtue of policies carried out by the administration. The farmers blamed Mr. Hoover for the upper limit. Mr. Hoover and his friends deny his responsibility for it. The maximum prices, they say, were decided upon by others. It remains incontestable that any decisions as to price were effectuated by Allied and American wheat purchases, all under Mr. Hoover's control through the Grain Corporation. It remains true that, if Mr. Hoover had thrown his great influence in favor of a higher price, it might have been achieved. It remains true that he did not do so. Why? Instructed opinion holds that if Mr. Hoover considered and decided against a higher price, his action was sound. The prices maintained were high enough to encourage ample wheat production for the war period. Higher prices would have put enormously greater strain on financial resources, would have further stimulated inflation of credit and currency, and would have left the farmers themselves, after the War, facing more drastic deflation, with larger stocks on hand. Yet I should like Mr. Hoover better if he accepted broad responsibility for the price of wheat, and justified it.

There is also complaint by the pork raisers. In 1917 there appeared a growing and serious shortage of hogs in this country. Investigation disclosed that the main reason for it was the high price of corn (on which hogs are fed) relative to the price of hogs. A committee of experts was called upon to study the matter, and in a report, read throughout the Middle West, it pointed out that during the ten-year period before the War, 11.67 bushels of corn at Chicago had sold, on the average, for as much as 100 pounds of hog. If enough were now to be paid for hog products to make 100 pounds worth as much as 13.3 bushels of corn, production could quickly be brought back to normal. Thereupon the Food Administration announced that, "as to hogs farrowed next spring [1918] we will try to stabilize the price so that the farmer can count on getting for each hundred pounds of hog ready for market, thirteen times the average cost per bushel of the corn fed into the hogs." Noted emissaries spread this promise broadcast, and the farmers took it seriously.

When the fall of 1918 came, the Administration had difficulty in fulfilling its promise. The ratio in Chicago fell in October to 10.5 to 1. There was a large crop of hogs, and the Allies wanted to buy them as cheaply as the market permitted. The price might have fallen further in a free market, but at least it was not maintained at the expected level. The average ratio for the crop proved

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be 11.4 to 1. This result was defended, not by an explanation of the difficulties, but by stating that the ratio of 13 to 1 had in fact been maintained between the price of 100 pounds of hog and the price of a bushel of corn *on the farm*. But corn on the farm is not the same as corn at Chicago, and the farmers had thought the promise referred to the Chicago price. Very likely Mr. Hoover was not to blame, as many indignant farmers believed, for the failure of the promise. But the defense offered does not seem quite candid.

Another essential activity of the Food Administration, undertaken as a complement to regulation of prices paid to the farmers, was limitation of the packers' profits. At the beginning, a rule-of-thumb limitation was laid down. By the early summer of 1918, it appeared that the result of this rule was to allow the packers tremendous gains. The Federal Trade Commission was asked to investigate and report. Its investigation was conducted by competent accountants of its staff, as well as by several of the most eminent private accountants, brought in for the purpose. The experts were agreed, in the main, that marked changes ought to be made in the profits regulation. Profits for the big five were already from two-and-one-half to three times as high as they had earned in 1912, 1913 and 1914. There is not space here to go into the complex details of the matter. But Mr. Hoover rejected *in toto* the Federal Trade Commission's analysis and recommendations. There is no question that, in many of his comments on the contentions of the accountants, Mr. Hoover was grossly in error. His view of the economics of the situation was naïve, to say the least. And the packers, as it turned out, made profits that were much too large. They were, furthermore, more injured by the subsequent deflation than they probably would have been, had the Trade Commission's advice been followed.

Now, the bearing of all this lies in the difference between the way the wheat and hog-raisers fared and the way the packers fared, under the Food Administration. The pressure of circumstances was allowed to prevail differently in one case than in the other. The significance of the contrast does not for a moment lie in any suspicion of corruption. There are many who would say that it lies in a bias of Mr. Hoover's in favor of big business. He may have such a bias, but I believe the explanation is less simple. It was not necessary to pay higher prices to the farmers in order to induce them to grow the needed products. It might have been difficult or even impossible to pay more. Prices enough higher to have benefited the individual farmer much would seriously have impeded prosecution of the War. On the other hand, the packers were powerful, aggressive and acquisitive. Mr. Hoover did not want to fight them and Germany at the same time. He was willing, therefore, to pay much for their coöperation, in view of the fact that even a large profit for them did not mean a heavy toll per pound of meat, and that some of the excess profits would be taxed back to the Treasury. Mr. Hoover's job was to be Administrator of Food for war purposes, not to administer justice. And Mr. Hoover is a practical man.

III

Mr. Hoover's brush with farm representatives did not end with the War. It so happened that his first contemporary as Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, was one of those who had opposed his course as Food Administrator. Relations were not cordial between the two departments. There was a feeling in Agriculture that Mr. Hoover's newly aggressive department was treading on its toes. Fears were expressed that he would take over, for his own glory, certain of the statistical work which bore both on agriculture and commerce. There was jealousy about the newly proposed commercial attachés abroad under Mr. Hoover; the Department of Agriculture wanted attachés of its own to deal with matters of crop marketing. Eventually Mr. Wallace, in an effort to do something to speed farm relief, gave sympathetic aid to the McNary-Haugen plan; Mr. Hoover vigorously opposed it. There is not one of these controversies in which an exceedingly good case cannot be made out for Mr. Hoover's position. And the strength of Mr. Hoover's influence with the Harding-Coolidge administration is demonstrated by the fact that in every one he was the victor. Mr. Wallace resigned, his subordinates in the Department who opposed and distrusted Mr. Hoover are there no longer; the McNary-Haugen plan was denounced; the present Secretary, Mr. Jardine, is in entire sympathy with Mr. Hoover and his policies.

One could go much further in demonstrating Mr. Hoover's influence in matters relating to other departments. Secretary Work of the Interior is close to him; the Bureau of Mines was bodily transferred from Interior to Commerce, with the assent and approval of Mr. Work, and much against the wil of some of its members who aspired to a Depar ment of Mines. The Department of State, which was jealous of Mr. Hoover's commercial attachés, did not prevail against him. *Per contra*, Mr. Hoover is generally credited with responsibility for the policy, announced by the State Department, of censoring private loans to foreign countries. As a result of such activities, there are those who fear Mr. Hoover as an ambitious man, grasping power wherever he can lay his hands on it.

In view of this well known energy, and in view of Mr. Hoover's demonstrated influence with the administration, one is surprised by an opposite strain of comment. It is met again and again, chiefly from those sympathetic with progressive or liberal causes. Let us list a few instances (most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of which cannot be documented, but for which excellent authority exists).

When the Lever food-control bill was being considered in Congress, labor became agitated because of a clause which might be interpreted as forbidding non-political strikes. To a conference of labor leaders Mr. Hoover gave his assurance that it was not so intended and would not be abused. Labor extended full support to the bill. After the War was over—in 1919—the clause was relied upon by a federal judge in an injunction against a national coal strike. Mr. Hoover, in private conversation, said he was shocked by the injunction. Publicly he said nothing.

Early in the Harding administration, Senator Norris developed an elaborate plan for emergency farm relief which would have involved the public financing of agencies to aid the distribution of American farm products throughout the world, by buying from producers' coöperatives and selling to consumers' coöperatives—thus clearing the channels of the excessive profits and waste of *laissez-faire* distribution. Mr. Norris was assured, on good authority, that Mr. Hoover favored the plan. At the last moment it became known that President Harding opposed it. Mr. Hoover testified against it.

Mr. Hoover sat in the Cabinet all through the scandals of the Harding regime—Forbes, Teapot Dome, Elk Hills, Daugherty. It has been said by his friends that he knew much about these things before they were made public, and felt outraged about them, that he would have resigned if action had not been taken. Yet there is no record or sign that he did anything to force action; nor is it known that he ever communicated any knowledge he may have had to those who pushed the investigations, or made any public comment on these affairs at the time or since.

A similar inactivity has been noted in the scandal of the corrupt Pennsylvania elections, although it is said by some close to Mr. Hoover that he was much disturbed by them. A word from Mr. Hoover on either of these matters would have done much to stiffen public opinion.

When the Child Labor Amendment was being attacked, Mr. Hoover's aid was sought by its supporters. He gave them promises of help—which, in view of his influence with the business world, would have been important. There is no record of any public word by him in its favor.

It is now said, by persons known to be of progressive tendency, that Mr. Hoover holds admirable opinions on such leading present issues as taxation, railway valuation, and foreign policy in Mexico and Nicaragua. Nothing officially escapes his lips on these subjects.

When explanation of this sort of thing is sought from Mr. Hoover's friends, the response is heated. Mr. Hoover is Secretary of Commerce, not President, or guardian of the public morals. Do you expect him to oppose the administration, or some other branch of it, in spite of his executive responsibilities, as a free lance might? Or do you expect him to resign every other day? Furthermore, Mr. Hoover is a Quaker, not a crusader. One has to admit that a progressively inclined Secretary would have to keep a pretty close mouth in order to survive eight years of Harding and Coolidge. It is, however, true that Mr. Hoover is more than Secretary of Commerce, is something of a crusader, in certain respects. Circumstances allow him to be vigorous in one type of controversy, though not in another type. He fights when he thinks he can do so without endangering his position; not otherwise. For some reason, he remains where the circumstances can limit him as they do.

IV

The chief reason has been, of course, his work as Secretary of Commerce; it is by this that he would want to be judged. When he took the office, great hopes were entertained. As Food Administrator he had given evidence of the ability to promote, largely by voluntary means, better economic organization of supply and distribution so as to avoid waste. Such a technique, applied in peace, would have tremendous possibilities. Mr. Hoover's Department has been teeming with activity of the general sort expected. He was the stage manager of the President's conference on unemployment, held in consequence of the depression of 1920-21. He sponsored the famous engineers' report on waste in industry. He has gone on from these beginnings by publishing an extensive series of current business statistics about production, stocks on hand, prices, employment and the like, by stimulating many industries to adopt programs reducing the number of sizes and styles of their products ("simplification"), by furthering a program of stabilization and economical construction in the building industry. He has energetically striven to assist export trade, and has spoken in favor both of more scientific research as an aid to industry and of more scientific research of the pure type. He has promoted the cause of the improved St. Lawrence and other waterways.

Yet there have been revealing limitations in these activities. The main result of the unemployment conference was a report by the National Bureau of Economic Research which recommended numerous methods of prevention and relief, to be initiated in advance of a depression. Among these were measures subsequently encouraged by Mr. Hoover, such as better statistical information, more intelligent management of individual concerns, the adoption of plans to diminish seasonal slackness. But among them were also other measures, of greater importance—such as advance planning of public works to compensate for industrial fluctuations, a national system of employment exchanges, reliable figures on unemployment, and unemployment insur-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance. In these recommendations Mr. Hoover has shown little or no interest. It so happens that he has pushed the measures of detail, the measures that would immediately benefit the individual employer, and has ignored the broader measures to which most employers were either indifferent or hostile. Today, when there is probably more unemployment than since 1921, when the index of factory employment stands 5 percent below a year ago, we have no national system of placing those who might find jobs, we have no detailed knowledge of unemployment in specific trades and localities, we have no means of compensating those out of work. And Mr. Hoover, ignoring these facts, contents himself with issuing statements about our great prosperity and its probable continuance.

The waste-elimination program has been carried out largely by "simplification." Manufacturers and others immediately interested in a given product are called together and told that it is their job, in their own interest and that of the public, to agree on a limitation of sizes and styles. Over sixty such projects have been accepted; thousands of needless varieties have been eliminated; immense savings have been made. Publications of the Department claim, as a result, great benefits to the ultimate consumer as to service and price. About these claims, critics are dubious. The ultimate consumer is seldom represented in the conferences. He has, indeed, few representatives to be invited, unless we think of the government itself as his agent. But the government leaves everything to the business man and his technicians. The sizes and styles chosen for preservation depend, not upon any scientific investigation of how best the ultimate consumer's needs might be met, but upon the prevailing existing demand, or upon the producers' convenience. A study, made by the Department, of the course of prices after the adoption of specific programs, shows that while in some cases they have fallen, in other cases they have risen. There is no assurance that most of the savings do not go into profits. That depends, as with any other improvement in process, on the exigencies of competition or monopoly, and the state of the market. No ingenuity of Mr. Hoover's has been devoted to carrying through to the consumer the benefits which make simplification popular with manufacturers.

It is quite possible that Mr. Hoover is unconscious of such limitations. Contrary to popular impression, and in spite of his excellence as engineer and executive, he is an indifferent economist. Many of his economic views are conceived in advance of the evidence, and are held stubbornly after the evidence goes against him. He is really interested in policies and activities; he is moved by hunches and prejudices; he is often impatient of candid research—even somewhat cold to the research of his own Department in the physical sciences, so long as it has not an immediate contribution to make to some pressing industrial problem.

When, in spite of the fact that no adequate survey of the situation had been made in any government department, he had decided that France ought to and could pay a large part of her debt to the United States, he was much annoyed by the careful studies of non-governmental economists indicating that she could not do so well. It is not known that he has ever studied or attempted seriously to refute the able documents on this most important subject, published, for instance, by the Institute of Economics. In this matter he adopted and held, without much inquiry, the popular attitude.

When, in 1924, certain coal operators asked for his advice about meeting the representatives of the United Mine Workers at Jacksonville, he advised them to do so and to conclude an agreement; this is much to his credit. But in his letter he said, after referring to the overproduction and disorganization of the bituminous industry, "The real cure is a period of continuous operation under free competition and full movement of coal." This, he said, "would result in the elimination of producers who depend on famine prices by the ordinary processes of competition. It would result in a concentration of labor in more continuous employment in the more economically worked mines. It would render the business of the lower cost operators more stable, the prices of coal would be lower."

He thus endorsed the belief in "free competition" held both by the union officials and the employers. But most of the results he predicted have not come to pass. The industry is more disorganized than ever. Experts disagreed with Mr. Hoover's prescription at the time, and have since shown, point by point, why it will not work. Their analysis is, to be sure, radical and unpopular. Since 1924 Mr. Hoover has given us no new light on soft coal—perhaps the sorest spot in the national economy.

Everyone will remember Mr. Hoover's outburst against the British on the ground of the restricting of rubber production under the Stevenson plan. Rubber prices were high. Tire manufacturers were complaining. The British were restricting the export of rubber from the growing territories under their jurisdiction. Mr. Hoover apparently believed, and said, that this course was iniquitous, that free competition should be restored, that if the British rubber interests continued to bleed us in this manner we could retaliate by monopolistic schemes. He overlooked the fact that the Stevenson plan was an attempt, however crude, at price stabilization, a plan which had formerly prevented the abandonment of many plantations when the price of rubber was low; that, without it, prices might later have gone much higher than they did. He showed no understanding of the fact that restriction of production in the interest of a fair price is generally

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognized by modern economists as a helpful measure in unduly competitive situations, as a preventive of booms and depressions, with their inevitable waste. It is true that prices should not be controlled wholly in the interest of the producer, that monopoly needs to be curbed. It is true that Mr. Hoover, by his activity in this regard, "threw a scare" into the British and was probably influential in bringing about a lower price. But he evinced no comprehension of the real economics of the situation. He has, furthermore, exhibited no such indignation against abuses of monopoly by American interests.

One of the most important issues now before the United States is the problem of electric power. Shall certain large power plants be publicly owned, as a check on the great profits of private monopoly? How may the present defects in regulation be remedied? Mr. Hoover has had close contacts with this issue at specific points, through his interest in Boulder Dam and the St. Lawrence. He has given no sign of concern about the consumers' welfare in the matter. Where does he stand on public operation, on valuation, on regulation? There is good authority for stating that, at certain points, he has brought pressure to bear in favor of the contentions of the private power interests. Perhaps this statement unfairly represents his present position. But if he is now opposed to the power lobby, those who would benefit from a publication of his views do not know them. On the record, one would expect Mr. Hoover to be more concerned with the technical developments in power production and distribution than with their harnessing in the consumers' interest.

Has Mr. Hoover ever investigated, or advised the administration, upon the tariff problem? Has he ever considered its bearing on his efforts to promote foreign trade, or on the Allied war debts? There is no evidence that he has.

The record does not show Mr. Hoover to be, in his administration of the Department of Commerce, consciously an ally of predatory business interests. Neither does it show him to be a superlative economist, with a far-seeing social policy. His justification for remaining in the Harding-Coolidge Cabinet at the cost of strategic silences is good, but not overwhelming. It may be fair to say that he has done as well in that *milieu* as anyone could be expected to do.

V

One cannot classify Herbert Hoover with the political Presidents. He is shy, he is not master of the ready phrase and the warm handclasp, his speeches do not resound, he is even a little weak in organizing political support. In the higher sense of politics, he cannot be expected to become a national symbol, inspiring enthusiasm among those he does not know by virtue of deep confidence in his spiritual integrity or his ultimate meaning. People will never honor the precedents of "Teddy" and "Al" by calling him "Bertie." Nor will they rally about him for espousal of moral issues, as they did about Woodrow Wilson.

He seems more like the well trained head of a great industrial corporation. He is an indefatigable worker. Energy radiates through his administrative staff. He is constantly doing things. Slackness, indifference, insubordination do not flourish about him. He will want, not to let things drift, but to manage, and he will care about detail. He will be "bullish" about the future. He will look for "results," and what he means by "results" will be something immediate and tangible. He will be impatient of slow processes. He will not have the imaginative genius of a Henry Ford, to plan and execute the impossible, to combat the ruling tendency and the powers that be, occasionally to risk the absurd. He will waste no time on lost causes, or causes which cannot win until his day is over. He will be in advance of the procession, but not too far in advance. He will sacrifice everything which it is necessary to sacrifice to his immediate objective. His intention will be, on the whole, generous and humane. He will work on hunches and will make quick adjustments to situations. Circumstances and the balance of existing forces will determine his direction. He will not inquire too closely what all his activity is really about. Nothing he does will have revolutionary implications; rather he will refine and improve what he finds ready to his hand. And he will make egregious mistakes.

While business leaders generally like him, a few of the larger ones distrust him. I believe there is little occasion for this distrust. It is true that, as a public executive, he does things to improve and enlarge the realm of his administration just as any one of them would try to enhance the importance of his own organization. Among those who are jealous of every activity of government, because it may intrude on the power of private business, this seems "dangerous." But Mr. Hoover is too much like them to think or act very differently about large issues. He will do much to help the present industrial order in the United States to live up to its better possibilities. He will do little to change it as its rulers do not want it changed. Anyone coming to him in advocacy of a reform will have to show that there is a combination of forces which can effectuate the reform before he will heartily espouse it. For Mr. Hoover is "practical." If it be objected, by those who are not so much in sympathy with the present regime in industry, that this age needs more vision, more understanding, more feeling for imponderables than Mr. Hoover is likely to give it, the answer is obvious. The man they want may exist, but they cannot have him as a Republican President. Perhaps even Mr. Hoover cannot be nominated. The social and economic scene will have to be much changed before a better man can be the protagonist.

GEORGE SOULE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

THINGS "clarified" so quickly around here last week that a lot of the "boys," as the Harry Hawes type of Senator, with well meant, if somewhat obtuse condescension, loves to call those whose hard fate it is to have to write about them as if they were really interesting and important, were left far out on the well known limb.

Thanks to the inherent caution of a warped and suspicious nature, a firm belief in the canniness of the Coolidge character and a conviction, from the start, of the silliness of the draft movement, I was not out nearly so far as some. But I was not prepared for the speed with which the second renunciation by the austere Mr. Hughes followed the second renunciation by the noble Calvin. There is some ground, I think, for suspecting collusion if not conspiracy between them. If the full story came out, it might soothe the troubled spirit of that slightly too unanimous New York Committeeman, Mr. Charles D. Hilles. I learn he is in a state of unprecedented flustration over the flopping of his "favorite son." Or again, his perturbation might be increased and his self-complacency badly rumpled—though that last I think very doubtful indeed.

There is, however, no time to dawdle along further about stuff as old as these last-week renunciations, their cause and effect. The necessities compel immediate consideration of the existing situation. Here is Herbert Clark Hoover, the efficiency marvel, bounding merrily along the track so far ahead of nearly every other horse in the race that, unless some dirty work is done, he has an excellent chance to gallop away with the much prized presidential nomination. With Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hughes both in the box stalls, it does look as if he ought to outrun all the others —with the possible exception of Dawes. I am informed almost every day by one or more of his managers, trainers, advisers, publicity experts or secretaries, with whom Washington is getting pretty thoroughly cluttered up, that he has now in sight actually more than two hundred delegates. By the time this piece is printed, the score will probably be much larger, because from all sections politicians and publishers who are more or less key men are coming here or being sent for in the interests of his candidacy. They arrive, are met by a secretary and dine or lunch with Hoover and either the alert and astute Walter Brown or the amiable but unstimulating Dr. Work. They talk politics, very practical politics. They go back home and go to work. That is the Hoover campaign up to date and, believe me, it has been effectively conducted.

Since the second renunciation, Herbert himself has thrown aside the restraint that made it painful to talk with him. Until that came, he was so self-conscious about his candidacy, so morose about the fix in which he was left by the failure of Calvin to check the draft talk, that his sufferings were obvious, and conversation with him on the subject was delicate, difficult and depressing. Within the last week, however, a difference has come over Herbert. Quite obviously he construed the second Coolidge statement as letting down the bars. He now talks freely and with convincing naïveté of his candidacy.

But there is always something in politics, as in every other field of human activity, to furrow the brow and make heavy the heart, no matter how sweet things may look on the surface. Having found relief from the haunting fear that the noble Calvin was really planning to hold on to his job for another four years, Herbert and the Herbertites are now sleeping fitfully because of the fishy eye with which the saintly Andrew, whom Mr. Hearst, breaking all previous eulogistic records, last week lauded as not next to, but greater than Alexander Hamilton, looks upon the Hoover candidacy. It is held by those close to Herbert—and that includes eighty-seven of our foremost Washington correspondents and twenty-two leading editorial writers—that if Mr. Mellon would drop his aloofness and smile upon the Hoover-for-President movement, it would be all over except checking up. The soundness of this reasoning is beyond dispute. With what Herbert has, added to what the sainted Andrew can give him, there would be nothing left to do except pick out the key-noter for the convention and decide who shall succeed William M. Butler, the intrepid Coolidge Committee Chairman, who a day or so ago darkened the whole 1928 outlook for Senator David I. Walsh by deciding not to run against him in Massachusetts next fall.

Various stories are afloat about the real Mellon attitude. It is said that, while it is true he does not like Hoover, he does not dislike him quite as much as he dislikes Dr. Dawes. It is said that he is much disappointed over the failure of Mr. Hilles to make good with the Hughes candidacy. It is said that he takes the suggestion of his own name by Hearst quite seriously, and that he really wants the Pennsylvania delegation to present him for at least a few complimentary ballots. The fact remains that, up to the present writing, he is most distinctly not pro-Herbert.

While I am not of counsel for Herbert, I have for him feelings of profound admiration and respect. These inspire me to volunteer some advice as to how to melt the distressing iciness of the Mellon attitude and bring the old gentleman around. As I see it, there are two methods to follow. One of these is to find some excuse for incurring the animosity and opposition of the Hon. Gifford Pinchot. Under no circumstances, Herbert, let Gifford in the door. Slam it in his face. If he offers support, reject it. If he comes out for you, repudiate him. The mention of Gifford's name, the mere thought of Gifford, is poison to Uncle Andy.

The other way to deal with the Mellon situation is for Herbert to have a few friendly doings with good old Bill Vare. He need not go too far with Bill, but far enough to show that abused statesman that the sentiment toward him in the Hoover breast is not one of contempt, but rather sympathy. It would be easy, I think, to convince poor Bill that Herbert as President would recognize him both as a Senator and a state leader, if he happened to be Senator after 1928. This, I am told, is pretty certain, it being his intention to run again this year.

If such friendly relations could be established between Herbert and Bill, I am confident it would have a softening effect on the Mellon attitude. It would also have an immediate effect on David A. Reed, the Vare defender in the Senate, whose political fortunes are entirely dependent

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on brave Bill's Philadelphia machine, and whose habitual air of injured innocence is one of the most amusing things seen on Capitol Hill in a long time.

For what they are worth I offer these two suggestions to the Hoover managers for dealing with what seems, at present, to be their principal problem. Don't bother about the international bankers, but first, give Gifford the cold shoulder and then pat good old Bill on the back. If these do not bring the Mellon outfit around, then give them up. But these will. T. R. B.

Washington.

Another Reinhardt

Jedermann. German version by Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Century Theater. December 7, 1927.

SEEING his "Everyman" at the Century reduces Reinhardt to a showman, or at least I see no other way out of it. By a showman you mean a man in the theater who has a gift for picking on things that will go; for finding people—artists, composers, dramatists, actors, electricians—of every kind who are either gifted or effective; for assembling all these; and presenting effectively the whole to the public. A great showman is, in one sense, one who can do all this with great success, in finance and in general renown, both closely united in the theater world; in another sense, a great showman implies one who has made this *ensemble* of elements come to something, made it say something through its content and central idea.

I have seen only three of Reinhardt's productions so far: "The Miracle," "A Midsummer Night's Dream," and "Everyman." "The Miracle" was stupendous as an enterprise, and as press work in the newspapers and magazines over the country. It was a marvel of engineering, supervision, mechanics, generalship, organization, coöperation, labor. In the first act there was some stirring matter, moments that carried you powerfully along. In the rest there were occasional moments of remarkable acting. Otherwise "The Miracle" was strangely empty, without any spiritual center, without necessity, passion or conviction, and most of the time without any beauty, certainly without any choiceness in beauty, any final creation. And I had the distinct feeling that Reinhardt himself knew this quite as well as anyone.

Then came the famous production of "A Midsummer Night's Dream." This is a play that, after all, can stand almost any treatment, its substance and its artistic necessity are casual if often enchanting; its region is blest with freedom and fantasy. The production I saw at the Century was, doubtless, cut too much and so had an excess of pantomime, though no burdensome excess. It could have had more enchantment, though that was limited by the foreign language in which the immortal lines had to be heard and understood or not as the case might be. Otherwise the production was persuasive and delightful, very often beautiful, remarkably directed, and for the most part superbly and imaginatively costumed.

And now we have the "Jedermann," which I found first of all—taking it on the ground that is most profound and necessary if we are to think of it as a *bona fide* work of art, a living thing in human creation—very slight spiritually. There was no central conviction to it, no real Gothicism of soul, no indwelling terror, darkness and fire. To express this conviction you may use whatever visual design, whatever decor or directing you choose, at your own invention and peril, but the soul and sting and victory of it must be felt within you; you must have it to express.

On this central, final side, the Reinhardt "Jedermann" was *nil*, so far as the production went. The only contribution in this respect was the performance of Moissi. The Everyman that Moissi gives us is wholly modern, and is to no small extent in the realm of the neurotic, an element, doubtless, in its modernity. It is a fine piece of acting, thoroughly technical, varied and exact, though its high degree of individualization and of what we might call personal psychology cuts down somewhat the old intention of universal parable—at his hands Everyman is no longer every man. I did not find myself deeply moved. His performance had a certain solitary torment in it that expressed the loneliness of every man at this last stage of his earthly course, and made me think of a saying of Pascal's that each of us must die alone and must therefore act as if we were alone. I could see in this actor the greatest array of technique and the most complex emotional resource, though there was something about it of private exhibition that failed to carry me very far when, by its sheer inner strength, it might have compelled me to follow. Moissi, then, adds to "Jedermann" his own excitement about the role he plays, to that extent he believes. But he affords the only sort of conviction of any kind in the entire event.

There is another plane, however, on which we may take a thing like "Everyman." Without being very much moved by it or very serious about its peculiar soul, we may relish its naïve intensity, its Gothic combinations of elements, brutal, grotesque, lyric and poignant. We may appreciate the flavor of an epoch, a phase of art and civilization that it affords us, the quality of a period out of human history that it preserves to us. It is a lower plane, this, but a most interesting one, for all that. It concerns not so much life, death and doomsday, as culture, diversion and taste. On this plane, the problem of production and revival turns on style and rendering, on stylization, even, to make a distinction, and forms of archaism or modernization or technical virtuosity. The delights of such an occasion for the audience have the chance of being delectable and satisfactory enough. In the absence of a deeper content, these stylistic and inventive elements may come forward into a greater conspicuousness, into a joyous display of many talents, motives and contrivances.

On this style side, and with regard to the creative invention and taste shown in the visual part of "Jedermann" and the directing of it, I can only say that the result is surprising indeed. The directing is smooth and expert, the control of the groups and lighting expert. But in general, the movement and mass design appear to be an effort of ten years ago—the march of the cooks, for one good example, with their caps, looks like a minor revue out of the stale past. The costumes are without style theatrically, most of them dull reproductions of early German painting; their designer does not seem to remember that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere copying of historical pieces is no more theatric than ordinary clothes from the shop windows of today. Now and then the fabric is interesting, or the mode of the garment, or its color, but that is not much to say of a costume for the theater. The banquet scene is the familiar long table across the stage, and is without eloquence or power of any kind, and without taste.

The setting for "Jedermann" has effective elevations, in dark colors; and, on the main platform, a series of Gothic arches, a mere frame, gilded. The idea is effective, though familiar in the theater since the early days of Gordon Craig. But these arches are not very good in themselves either as pure line or as theater; to know how poor they are, we have only to remember the dramatic force of Mr. Robert Edmond Jones' arches for "Macbeth," or, in the book of his drawings, the design he made for Maeterlinck's play of "The Seven Princesses."

Perhaps we must wait and see the Reinhardt of the intimate theater. STARK YOUNG.

Præterita

THAT an abridgement of "Modern Painters" should lately have been published may be held to prove that while people still want to read Ruskin, they have no longer the leisure to read him in the mass. Happily, for it would be hard to let so great a writer recede from us, there is another and much slighter book of Ruskin's, which contains as in a teaspoon the essence of those waters from which the many-colored fountains of eloquence and exhortation sprang. "Præterita"—"outlines of scenes and thoughts perhaps worthy of memory in my past life" as he called it—is a fragmentary book, written in a season of great stress toward the end of his life, and left unfinished. It is, for these reasons perhaps, less known than it should be; yet if anybody should wish to understand what sort of man Ruskin was, how he was brought up, how he came to hold the views he did, he will find it all indicated here; and if he wishes to feel for himself the true temper of his genius, these pages, though much less eloquent and elaborate than many others, preserve it with exquisite simplicity and spirit.

Ruskin's father was "an entirely honest" wine merchant, and his mother was the daughter of the landlady of the Old King's Head at Croydon. The obscurity of his birth is worth notice because he paid some attention to it himself, and it influenced him much. His natural inclination was to love the splendor of noble birth and the glamor of great possessions. Sitting between his father and mother when they drove about England in their chariot taking orders for sherry, he loved best to explore the parks and castles of the aristocracy. But he owned manfully, if with a tinge of regret, that his uncle was a tanner and his aunt a baker's wife. Indeed, if he reverenced aristocracy and what it stood, or should stand for, he reverenced still more the labors and virtues of the poor. To work hard and honestly, to be truthful in speech and thought, to make one's watch or one's table as well as tables and watches can be made, to keep one's house clean and pay one's bills punctually were qualities that won his enthusiastic respect. The two strains are to be found conflicting in his life and produce much contradiction and violence in his work. His passion for the great French cathedrals conflicted with his respect for the suburban chapel. The color and warmth of Italy fought with his English puritanical love of order, method and cleanliness. Though to travel abroad was a necessity to him, he was always delighted to return to Herne Hill and home. Again, the contrast finds expression in the marked varieties of his style. He is opulent in his eloquence, and at the same time meticulous in his accuracy. He revels in the description of changing clouds and falling waters, and yet fastens his eye to the petals of a daisy with the minute tenacity of a microscope. He combined, or at least there fought in him, the austerity of the puritan and the sensuous susceptibility of the artist. Unluckily for his own peace of mind, if nature gave him more than the usual measure of gifts and mixed them with more than her usual perversity, his parents brought him up to have far less than the usual power of self-control. Mr. and Mrs. Ruskin were both convinced that their son John was to become a great man, and in order to insure it they kept him like any other precious object, in a cardboard box wrapped in cotton wool. Shut up in a large house with very few friends and very few toys, perfectly clothed, wholesomely nourished and sedulously looked after, he learned, he said, "Peace, obedience, faith," but on the other hand, "I had nothing to love . . . I had nothing to endure . . . I was taught no precision nor etiquette of manners. . . . Lastly and chief of evils, my judgment of right and wrong, and power of independent action, were entirely undeveloped; because the bridle and blinkers were never taken off me." He was not taught to swim, that is to say, but only to keep away from the water.

He grew up, therefore, a shy, awkward boy, who was intellectually so highly precocious that he could write the first volume of "Modern Painters" before he was twenty-four, but was emotionally so stunted that, desperately susceptible as he was, he did not know how to amuse a lady for an evening. His efforts to ingratiate himself with the first of those enchanting girls who made havoc of his life reminded him, he said, of the efforts of a skate in an aquarium to get up the glass. Adèle was Spanish-born, Paris-bred and Catholic-hearted, he notes, yet he talked to her of the Spanish Armada, the Battle of Waterloo and the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some such pane of glass or other impediment was always to lie between him and the freedom of ordinary intercourse. Partly the boyish days of anxious supervision were to blame. He had much rather go away alone and look at things, he said, than stay at home and be looked at. He did not want friends; he marvelled that anyone should be fond of a creature as impersonal and self-contained as a *camera lucida* or an ivory foot-rule. And then he was still further withdrawn from the ordinary traffic of life by Nature who, to most people only the background, lovely or sympathetic to their own activities, was to him a presence mystic, formidable, sublime, dominating the little human figures in the foreground. But though she thus rapt him from his fellows, Nature did not console him. The cataract and the mountain did not take the place of the hearth and lamplight and children playing on the rug; the beauty of the landscape only made more terrible to him the wickedness of man. The rant and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fury and bitterness of his books seem to spring, not merely from the prophetic vision, but from a sense of his own frustration. More eloquent they could hardly be; but we cannot help guessing that had little John cut his knees and run wild like the rest of us, not only would he have been a happier man, but instead of the arrogant scolding and preaching of the big books, we should have had more of the clarity and simplicity of "Præterita."

For in "Præterita," happily, there is little left of these old rancors. At last Ruskin was at peace; his pain was no longer his own, but everybody's pain; and when Ruskin is at peace with the world, it is surprising how humorously, kindly, and observantly he writes of it. Never were portraits more vividly drawn than those of his father and mother; the father, upright, able, sensitive, yet vain, too, and glad that his clerk's incompetence should prove his own capacity; the mother, austere and indomitably correct, but with a dash of "the Smollettesque" in her, so that when a maid toppled backward over a railing in full view of a monastery, she laughed for a full quarter of an hour. Never was there a clearer picture of English middle-class life when merchants were still princes and suburbs still sanctuaries. Never did any autobiographer admit us more hospitably and generously into the privacy of his own experience. That he should go on for ever talking, and that we should still listen, is all we ask, but in vain. Before the book is finished the beautiful stream wanders out of his control and loses itself in the sands. Limpid as it looks, that pure water was distilled from turmoil; and serenely as the pages run, they resound with the echoes of thunder and are lit with the reflections of lightning. For the old man who sits now babbling of his past was a prophet once and had suffered greatly.

VIRGINIA WOOLF.

Company Unionism in Deadly Parallel

IN the case against the injunction sought by the Interborough Rapid Transit Company of New York (see our editorial in this issue) the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees uses the following comparison as part of the evidence to show the difference in validity between itself as an independent union and the company union—the Brotherhood of Interborough Rapid Transit Company Employees.

In parallel columns are enumerated briefly a few of the most striking and fundamental differences between the two organizations, as shown in their constitutions. Columns headed "Brotherhood" refer to the Interborough Brotherhood, and those headed "Association" to the Amalgamated Association.

PREAMBLE

Brotherhood	*Association*	*Remarks*
Declaration by "We, the employees"	Declaration by "We, the Amalgamated Association," etc.	Brotherhood expression of "We the employees" is an ambiguity evidently utilized because there was no general meeting at any specific date to frame or adopt the constitution.
No mention of any date or convention or assemblage.	"this day and date assembled in convention."	
No action taken by declarants. Simply a declaration that "we are fully competent to take up and adjust with our employers all questions as to rates of pay," etc.	Action taken by declarants—"do ordain and establish this Constitution and these Laws for the government of said Association."	The declaration of the Brotherhood Constitution is evidently made for publicity effect, rather than as an act by an organized body.
Objects declared to be "uninterrupted transit service to the public, a complete understanding between employer and employee . . . and the best possible conditions for fellow workers."	Objects declared to be "to secure and defend our rights, advance our interests as working men, create an authority whose seal shall constitute a certificate of character, intelligence and skill," etc., including "to encourage the principle and practice of conciliation and arbitration in the settlement of all differences between labor and capital."	The natural object of a genuine Association would be, first, to protect and advance the rights and interests of its members. No organization is needed to secure "uninterrupted transit service."
Provides that the constitution shall be "deemed to be a contract between the Brotherhood and each of its members individually and the Interborough Rapid Transit Company."	No mention of the constitution as a contract with employer.	No constitution of an independent organization, adopted by genuine representatives of the employees, could possibly constitute a contract with the employer, either collectively or individually.

MEMBERSHIP

"All employees of the Company shall become members of the Brotherhood." (With exception of those having disciplinary power.)—Art. I. Sec. 4. Newly appointed employees must agree to join Brotherhood as a condition of employment.—Id. Any local organization has right to waive exemption from membership for those in disciplinary positions.—Art. I. Sec. 5.	Street and electric railway employees, if of good moral character, in good health, and competent workmen, are eligible. No compulsion to join.—Sec. 66. No one in disciplinary position may be member. This provision may be waived in case of track foremen, who may not, however, participate in work of Association as to negotiations with employer.—Sec. 67.	Membership in a genuine union must, of course, be voluntary. A constitution which decrees that all employees shall become members must rest on the authority of the employer.

GENERAL CONVENTION

None	General conventions must meet biennially. Detailed provision as to basis of representation in general convention, and manner of election of delegates.—Sec. 5-14. "The policies, laws and plans for the direction of this association shall be adopted and put into force from time to time by the direction of the regular conventions."—Sec. 15.	There is no opportunity for members of the Brotherhood to elect delegates to a representative assembly, which constitutes the chief legislative body, as distinguished from the executive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brotherhood	*Association*	*Remarks*
General Committee or General Executive Board		
Members elected every two years, on specified basis of representation, by employees grouped as locals.—Art. I. Sec. 11.	Members elected by the General Convention.—Sec. 31.	This is the main executive body of both organizations.
Disputes with Employer		
Gen. Com. adjusts all controversies between company and Brotherhood, and its decision is "final and binding upon all members of the Brotherhood."—Art. I, Sec. 9 and 10.	Controversies with employers first taken up by local committee or executive boards, and attempt to adjust made. Full report then made to meeting of local Division members. If dispute is serious, secret strike ballot of members may be then taken. If two-thirds favor strike, President of Association attempts to settle dispute. A proposed settlement of dispute—otherwise than by arbitration—must be ratified by members of local Division. If President cannot settle, he then proposes arbitration to employer. If employer refuses to arbitrate, General Executive Board may then authorize the strike. If General Executive Board refuses to authorize strike, local Division may appeal to referendum vote of entire Association.—Sec. 120-125.	There is a marked difference between the final authority of the General Committee of the Brotherhood in adjusting disputes, and the thorough and democratic procedure of the Association in this regard. No genuine union allows its executives to make final settlements of serious issues, without reference back to the membership.
When General Committee is unable to settle dispute with the company, it shall be submitted to arbitration.—Art. VI. Sec. 8.		
Board of arbitration shall consist of one member selected by General Committee, one member selected by the company, and one selected by these two. If they cannot agree, third member shall be appointed by a justice of the Supreme Court of New York City, and should he neglect or refuse to make the appointment the third member shall be appointed by the President of the Chamber of Commerce of N. Y. City.—Art. VI. Sec. 8.		Note that the Association cannot strike if the employer will arbitrate, and even then it cannot do so without authorization of the General Executive Board.
		No genuine labor organization would permit the "neutral" member of an arbitration board to be appointed by employing interests.
"Discipline and Efficiency shall not be submitted to Arbitration"—Id.		This is obviously a provision which would be inserted in a constitution only in the interest of the employer, not by an autonomous labor organization.
Election of Locals		
Election Committee, appointed by President of General Committee, passes on eligibility of candidates for local offices and supervises elections.—Art. VII.	Locals conduct their own elections under constitution and rules, except "where trouble arises."—Sec. 34, 40, 41, 42.	The centralized control of the Brotherhood opens the way to control by the company.
Amendments to Constitution		
Amendments to the constitution were approved by Board of Directors of the Interborough Rapid Transit Company.—Extract from minutes, p. 22-23.	No such provision or action.	No independent union could or would submit amendments to its constitution for ratification by the employer.
Removal or Discipline of Officers and Members		
Gen. Committee has power to remove from office any representative or member of Gen. Committee "who, in their opinion, is not acting in the best interests of the Brotherhood." No appeal provided for.—Art. I. Secs. 13-16. Officers of Gen. Committee may expel members of the Brotherhood. No appeal provided for.—Art. II. Sec. 8.	General Executive Board has power to suspend local officers or members or suspend, fine or expel International officers, who "violate the laws and policies of the Association." In all cases the offender may appeal to the Convention, whose decision is final.—Secs. 32 and 33.	No genuine union permits discipline of officers or members without appeal.
Constitution and Contract		
All applicants for admission to Brotherhood must sign obligation, which constitutes a contract with the company, promising not to join the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employes or any other labor organization.—Art. VIII. Sec. 4, Appendix A.	No corresponding provision.	Unions, which exist for collective bargaining, naturally would not ask or even permit their members to sign individual contracts with the employer. The individual contract invalidates the genuineness of collective bargaining.

The work contract between the Interborough and the company Brotherhood, which the company forces all employees to agree to individually as a condition of employment, is the basis of the injunction. The company alleges that the A. F. of L. and the Amalgamated Association, in attempting to organize the employees, are inducing breach of this contract and hence should be enjoined. The unions argue both that the contract is invalid as a matter of law, and that it gives evidence of such inequality of bargaining power that the courts should not uphold its more inequable provisions.

If the items on the right below are weighed against those on the left, not *in vacuo* but in the light of the realities of the situation, it is seen that by this contract the men get substantially no advantages which they would not have were they hired at will, while the company gets all the advantages of a contract for a stated term and besides the wholly uncompensated-for promise not to join an intercompany union, which promise involves the surrender of the most basic and vital right of workmen, viz., the right freely to join with any or all of their fellow craftsmen to better their conditions:

1. The men are bound for two whole years not to join a union of their fellow-craftsmen working for other companies.	1. The company is free to join any association of employers and agree with them on wages, hours, etc.
2. If the men are incompetent to perform work assigned to them by the company, as to which assignment there is no agreement, merely a company order, they may be discharged without notice.	2. The company may employ incompetent men to discharge its duty to the men to provide them a safe and sanitary place to work in or to supervise and assign tasks, yet the men cannot quit, though they give the company ample opportunity to find men to take their places.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. If the men are inefficient at their tasks they may be discharged by the company without notice.	3. The company's bosses, superiors, etc., may be grossly inefficient in wasting men's time before and after hours for which they are paid, for example, yet by the contract the men cannot quit.
4. If the men are careless, not habitually but once or twice, the company can dismiss them without notice.	4. The company can be careless about mode of payment of wages, providing safe place to work, squandering their free time, not occasionally but habitually, yet the men cannot quit.
5. If the men drink, however slightly, they may be discharged without notice.	5. The company may retain drunken bosses, superintendents, etc., to direct men, yet they cannot quit.
6. Dishonesty on the part of the men is cause for discharge without notice.	6. Dishonesty and unfairness on the part of the management does not enable the men to quit.
7. Let a man disobey an order, though markedly autocratic, unreasonable or humiliating, and he may be discharged without notice.	7. There is no reciprocal undertaking on the part of the management, for breach of which the men may quit.
8. If the men neglect or refuse to perform any duty in the line of their employment, they may be discharged.	8. There may be multitudinous and substantial neglect on the part of the management or refusal to perform duty to men, yet they cannot quit.
9. If the men become physically unfit for their work, unless they have worked five years they may be discharged *instanter* or transferred to a position of lower pay at the company's option.	9. But they are bound for two years to keep on working under physically unfit bosses and managers, and cannot quit. There is no equating provision made by the company for sickness or old-age insurance in this contract.
10. If, for example, some new despatching device made motormen unnecessary, they may be discharged peremptorily.	10. Experience shows that this is a grave risk on labor, yet the company assumes no reciprocal risk.
11. If change in economic conditions or in seasonal operations makes any man's further services unprofitable to the company, he can be discharged at once.	11. If any of these men are offered more pay elsewhere, however much more, they are not free to quit, though they give the company ample opportunity to find men to take their places. There is no balancing advantage assured to the men, e. g., unemployment insurance.
	12. The provisions of the latter part of section 6, for putting men laid off on a waiting list, are not as substantial as they seem. a. Men laid off have no promise that their seniority is not lost. b. The waiting list is largely a convenience to the company in providing itself with a reserve labor supply by the hope held out.
	13. The provision for arbitration in sections 5 and 6 of the contract does not cover anything like all the causes for which the company can discharge without notice. Even though this provision covered all causes for discharge, it merely makes sure the cause is present. It does not save the men from the consequences of discharge above referred to.
	14. Expulsion from the Brotherhood is a cause for discharge by clause 5 of the contract, provided the company approves.
	15. By clause 12 this contract is perpetually binding unless a *party* gives notice. But an individual workman is not a *party* and cannot give such notice.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Meaning of Liberalism

SIR: I write to you on Thanksgiving Day to emphasize my gratitude for the existence of a few thousands of liberals in America, and for the work of the New Republic in giving them a sense of solidarity.

It is not surprising that recent correspondence published in your columns has expressed the uneasy feeling that the program of the liberals, if such it can be called, leaves nothing definite "to bite on." It is hard for us moderns, and especially, perhaps, American moderns, to realize that in seeking a scheme of social betterment we cannot safely adopt any of the "isms" of the past, all of which are based on emotion and dogma, but that the only sure plan is to pick and choose, a bit here and a bit there, to weigh, to discuss, to reject, and now and then to find, hidden in a mass of words, what appears to be a tiny bit of truth. The scientific or judicial attitude is not an easy one to attain, and the scientists themselves, like the Fundamentalists, are constantly committing treason against it, by rigidly excluding from consciousness alleged facts, not always because they do not believe them, but because, if true, they would interfere with the scientific system of thought. If I had the space, I could illustrate my point by some amazing examples of this scientific Fundamentalism.

In order to give your correspondents "something to bite on," let me submit this tentative definition of a liberal, for your comment, and to serve until a better one is found:

A liberal is a person who holds no prejudice or belief, scientific, religious or otherwise, which he cannot and will not discard in the face of facts, or the nearest thing to the facts that we limited humans can discover and adopt.

This imperfect definition, of course, ignores the deeper question of what facts are, but it is a beginning.

In order that your liberal readers may have a guiding thought, if not a program, I diffidently submit the following two quotations:

"A world full of happiness is not beyond human power to create, the obstacles imposed by inanimate nature are not insuperable. The real obstacles lie in the heart of man, and the cure for these is a firm hope informed and fortified by thought."

The second passage is to be found in Lord Bryce's "Studies in History and Jurisprudence." In his essay on "The Action of Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces on Political Constitutions," he states that the scientific (i. e., judicial, inductive and balanced) way of looking at *all* questions may *"modify men's habits of thought even in social and political matters."*

I sincerely hope that the New Republic will expand its discus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion of liberalism, which is most timely and important. May the New Republic continue to be the focal point for liberal minds!

HENRY R. CAREY.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

SIR: I have been much interested in the reactions to your editorial, "Dictating to the Future." All of them have been negative, unless you have exercised your Divine Right of selecting only adverse criticisms as an excuse for elaborating your thesis as you have so ably done in "Realistic Liberalism" (November 23). I suggest that you collect these and similar writings in one of the Dollar Books under some such title as "Little Lessons for Lazy Liberals," or, "Light for Liberals in Limbo."

These two editorials have pleased me immensely. In one respect, however, they "come tardy off." This is the fact that only *implicitly do they identify the realistic liberal attitude with the attitude of science.* This should be made very explicit. You may reply that science is merely one of the methods of achieving the ends of a liberal program. Agreed, but I contend that the method is the faith as well as the practice. That is all there is—they ain't no more.

If we define religion in terms of value as opposed to authoritarian dogma, existing ritual, or mystical revelation and communion, the only faith that can integrate the lines of realistic liberals is faith in the method of science. Thus, the true scientist, who is the true liberal, will be possessed by a passionate faith in his method of untiring research, bold experiment, and incurable curiosity. The faith is the practice. All the programs, purposes, and conclusions of the scientist are merely tentative, or at most, relatively permanent. The world for him is not limited by any mechanistic determinism; it is not a closed system, except as aspects may be closed by definition for research. His supreme values are not in his findings, but in faith in his method.

One of the essays for "Liberals in Limbo" should be an explicit statement of this enduring faith of the true liberal—his belief in and practice of scientifically disciplined curiosity and continuous experimentation in all things pertaining to the good life.

READ BAIN.

Oxford, Ohio.

SIR: Your recent editorials on liberalism have been read with deep interest, though, after the reading of the first one, there was a feeling of disappointment that you had not given to us a more specific suggestion as to a "tangible plan of action." But your second article seems to clear up the skies for the breaking forth of new light. As you say, it seems that many of us have been looking for some "purposive experiment in human betterment by improvements in political, economic and social machinery." We have failed to see that making new laws and organizing new institutions without some improvement in human nature will not get us forward very much in human progress.

When you say that liberalism was "fundamentally an attempt to give increasing dignity, enlightenment and fulfillment to human life," and that liberals should be asked "to revolutionize and reform their own minds," I believe you are opening a new source of light on the path we are to follow. This is in harmony with the words of James Harvey Robinson when he says: "I have no reforms to recommend, except the liberation of Intelligence, which is the first and most essential one." And again these words from the same author: "We should proceed to the thorough reconstruction of our mind, with a view to understanding actual human conduct and organization."

Again quoting from a New Republic editorial (November 23), "What liberals need to practise, then, is some activity of the mind which will increase the adequacy and self-possession of their personal lives while, at the same time, throwing light upon the adjustment of the individual to other individuals and to the world." And this from an editorial of October 26, "But the liberals are comparatively clumsy in propagating toleration, confidence, patience, inquisitiveness, understanding, humility and human kindness either in the minds of other people or in their own minds." Do not all these point toward education as the first real task and opportunity of liberals? In the words of G. Stanley Hall, is it not the true aim of college education to "break down prejudices, religious, political, philosophical, literary, social, and to postpone discipleship to any school or view in every field where there are many held by intelligent and sincere men?"

We must admit that the present system of education is not doing very much toward the accomplishment of this task in the liberalization of the minds of American youth. In raising the standard of work along technical lines, in enlarging programs of endowment and equipment, and in the great increase of attendance, it would seem that education has made progress, if these things are counted the same as education. But in modernization of the curriculum and humanizing of knowledge to free the minds of the youth from superstitions and prejudices, little progress is being made. If education is to provide the source of liberalization, it must be a new type of education. Again quoting from Robinson:

> Those who plan out courses of study and write books for the schools are not free, but must often make very humiliating terms with unintelligence. . . . Education ought to be largely devoted to the issues upon which the young, as they grow up, should be in a position to form an intelligent opinion. . . . We should have a dynamic education to fit a dynamic world. The world should not be presented to students as happily standardized but as urgently demanding readjustment.

If education is to meet the challenge and serve its true purpose, we must have more experimental schools similar to Commonwealth and others that will help students find the meaning of life and help equip them for its task.

If people of liberal minds will assist some of us to establish such schools, and watch the results in the lives and communities of the students for a few years, they will find more ground for encouragement and hope for the future than in almost any other way in which they can direct their energies.

Lynchburg, Virginia. EDWARD C. WILSON.

Old-Age Security

SIR: At this time of the year, when so many sentimental appeals for the aged are sent forth, I am certain your readers will be interested to learn of, and perhaps help, one of the most important movements recently undertaken to provide an honorable and self-respecting means of caring for our worn-out toilers of all classes.

The problem of old-age dependency in the United States is growing more serious every day. While the number of aged is increasing, the opportunities for employment are constantly diminishing, for many employers today refuse to give employment to men and women after the forties.

It is encouraging that, even at this time of stagnant public sentiment in all constructive legislation, there is developing a vigorous and powerful movement in behalf of old-age-pension legislation. Six states and the Territory of Alaska have already enacted such laws on their statute books. Local committees urging this legislation have been organized in many states, and recently a definite drive for such legislation has been launched by representatives of labor, civic and fraternal organizations in New York City.

Sponsoring and stimulating this movement is the American Association for Old Age Security with offices at 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City. This association was organized about a year ago, and is headed by Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as President, and A. Epstein, author of "Facing Old Age," as Secretary. It is made up of representatives of labor, the Churches and various other civic bodies. It aims to promote adequate security for the old people of our community by means of state and federal legislation. In order to carry on this movement most effectively, the Association is badly in need of financial help to meet its modest budget for 1928.

I am certain many of your readers are sufficiently interested in this humane cause to place the American Association for Old Age Security on their Christmas gift list.

ELISABETH GILMAN,
Vice-President.

Baltimore, Maryland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Counterfeiters

The Counterfeiters, translated from the French of André Gide by Dorothy Bussy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $3.

MY review of "The Counterfeiters," if ever I have to write one, will consist of a certain number of paragraphs, each as true as I can make it, but they won't compose into a likeness. By putting the emphasis in the wrong places, the review will distort the book. I shall fail to define the parts played in my total impression by M. Gide's extraordinary continuous readableness and by his unobtrusive decency; or to explain why his tact, which is never furtive, which you couldn't even call too guarded, is yet, to my taste, a shade too obliging, always ready to give me first aid. I shan't succeed in getting the proportions right. Either M. Gide's noteworthiness as an artist or his restraint as a propagandist will be out of scale, no matter how hard I try to relate them to each other. Besides, though I'm willing—at least I hope I'm not unwilling—to learn a little of the tolerance he wishes to propagate, I neither like his way of teaching tolerance nor am able to think of another way which I might like. That's not a defensible position, obviously. Another case of wrong emphasis. Perhaps a good review of "The Counterfeiters" wouldn't put any emphasis anywhere.

I don't say all this to myself out of routine modesty. It is possible both to fancy oneself as a reviewer and also to own oneself floored by "The Counterfeiters." I can't at the moment think of anybody who will respond appropriately to all the stimuli he will find here. Such an all-round responder will have to share Mr. Percy Lubbock's interest in the craft of fiction; and Judge Ben Lindsey's interest in the temptations which lie in wait for boys between fourteen and twenty, particularly city-bred boys. He will enjoy meeting, even in a novel, the discursive mind. He will like to stop and think, for example, about "that deliberate avoidance of life which gave style to the works of the Greek dramatists . . . or to the tragedies of the French XVIIth century. Is there anything more perfectly and deeply human than these works? But that's just it—they are human only in their depths; they don't pride themselves on appearing so—or, at any rate, on appearing real. They remain works of art." And, by the time he had finished "The Counterfeiters," its quite perfect reader would have changed his mind about homosexuality. He would have passed from a state of lesser to a state of greater open-mindedness, and he would prefer his last state to his first.

No, it would be useless for me to try and make a noise like this many-sided reader. But somewhere or other in my review, by way of compensating, by way of revealing more sides than I have, I might let out the fact that this is not my first acquaintance with M. Gide. Let it out casually, if possible, perhaps by quoting what the author of "Paludes" (the "Paludes" that never gets written) says of himself to Angèle: *"Ah! je voulais encore, délicate amie, vous faire remarquer combien j'ai la plaisanterie sérieuse."* Perhaps M. Gide kept one eye on "Paludes" while he was writing "The Counterfeiters." Or half an eye. In method the two books are a little alike on top. To pull with bored hands, and ever so accurately, all our legs all the time—that was the point of "Paludes," which seemed to be going somewhere and did not arrive anywhere. No wonder M. Gide calls it a *"sotie."* In "The Counterfeiters," a method ostensibly as aimless results in a novel which progresses, without appearing to care where it strays, by one carefully sinuous winding after another—"I choose not to foresee its windings," M. Gide says, and seems not to foresee them—progresses with perfect assurance, and an air of lacking assurance, steadily toward the place he had in view from the first. A go-as-you-please chronicle, which exists in order to record pretty much everything that happens in the course of a few months to three or four related households in Paris—that is what "The Counterfeiters" looks like. In reality every episode is hand-picked. M. Gide knows what he is about. He is making a plight-of-youth context for the one episode he intends us to compare and contrast with that context. He does it well. An artist ought to make his different materials severely one, if possible. M. Gide does the impossible. He makes his track and his red herrings severely one.

I have forgotten, or else I never knew, the name of the French novelist who said of fiction, *"C'est un art trop difficile."* M. Gide's art of fiction, as we see it in "The Counterfeiters," must have been extra difficult. At first sight he seems to be multiplying his difficulties out of pure philoprogenitiveness. The central figure in "The Counterfeiters" is a novelist, Edouard, who is writing a novel called "The Counterfeiters," and who has invented, as his central figure, a novelist who is writing a novel. . . . No, M. Gide does not continue, he pulls up just there, having suggested to us an endless series of novels, each of them called "The Counterfeiters" and each including among its characters a novelist at work on a novel called "The Counterfeiters." Thus M. Gide invites our minds to travel, remove by remove, as far away as they please from the real world, and on their way back to stop at the world he shows us in his "Counterfeiters," and to accept it as real. Such is one of the traps he sets for our credence. He sets others, each as carefully exposed as this one, as unavoidable, as sure-fire. Edouard, talking to some friends at Saas-Fée, says of his "Counterfeiters": "For more than a year now I have been working at it, nothing happens to me that I don't put into it—everything I see, everything I know, everything that other people's lives and my own teach me. . . . What I want is to express reality on the one hand, and on the other that effort to stylize it into art of which I have just been speaking. . . . And the subject of the book, if you must have one, is just that struggle between what reality offers him [i. e., novelist No. 3, the one Edouard has invented] and what he desires to make of it." Again M. Gide wins his bet. Our attention is fastened on this struggle, which never begins, and on this contrast, suggested often and nowhere exhibited, between life and art, between raw material and finished product, and thus we are all the readier to accept as raw material, as reality not yet touched by the novelist, the persons and events in M. Gide's novel.

Edouard is always studying one or another of the difficulties which perplex a novelist, always leaving it from his own standpoint unresolved, and whenever he does so he resolves one of M. Gide's difficulties, he overcomes or slips round or removes an obstacle to credibility. In M. Gide's hands, this method works with such precision that nearly all his novel is as credible as Defoe. I believe whatever he tells me, and whatever Edouard tells me—about a third of "The Counterfeiters" is Edouard's journal. I accept the exceptional, the police-court-itemish part of M. Gide's material, as trustfully as the part which records what might happen to any boy somewhere between fourteen and twenty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet any summary of this material would merely illustrate the difficulty of thinking it a likeness of average adolescence: Bernard steals once, excusably, and steals no more. George not only steals, he is a thief. Armand is afraid he has syphilis, and he may be right. Olivier loses his virginity to a prostitute, he is disgusted, he loathes himself. When Bernard loses his, with Sarah, he does not lose any self-respect. (As for Sarah, on this occasion, I'm uncertain whether her virginity was then lost, or had gone before.) A counterfeiter persuades Ghéri to put false coins into circulation. Ghéri persuades Phiphi and George to help him. They get caught and get off. The same three boys trick and frighten a younger boy, Boris, into suicide. Olivier, in a fit of jealousy, drops into the clutches of Robert de Passavant, a well-to-do promiscuous sodomite. All of which prepares one to feel that Olivier, when he begins his homosexual love affair with Edouard, might have done worse, and has.

Yet I do not feel this, although in words I concede its truth. So far as I am concerned, M. Gide, detached propagandist, has been wasting his time. He bids me distinguish between homosexuals and homosexuals. I refuse, I go on repeating that the homosexuals who have received, and who show, their stigmata are not to my liking. I refuse M. Gide's subtlest invitation of all—an invitation to feel that Edouard's and Olivier's love affair, if Edouard didn't happen to be Olivier's mother's half-brother, mightn't be so bad, might not be half bad, might get by. And I cannot help imputing to M. Gide a self-restraint which affects me like insincerity. I suspect him of rating the loves of nephew and uncle many hands higher than he seems to wish me to rate them. If he had not kept himself so in hand, if he had shaken out all reefs and let himself run before the wind of his doctrine, I fancy he would have poetized Edouard and Olivier into a modern counterpart of Herakles and Hylas. I accuse this teacher of tolerance of suppressing a wish to teach more. *"Pour moi,"* as M. Gide once said, *"je préfère la grossièreté."*

This is unfair. Any concentration upon his propaganda is unfair. He is a serious artist—"serious" in the French sense. In this novel, moving, readable, aloof, all the episodes, though chosen to make the right background, not too dark, not too light, for the Edouard-Olivier episode, though they exist as means to an end, exist also for their own sake. My fault, no doubt, if I feel about M. Gide's propaganda as my Uncle Toby felt about the great Lipsius' precocity.

P. L.

Boy in the Wind

Boy in the Wind, by George Dillon. New York: The Viking Press. 96 pages. $1.50.

ONE of the commonest of literary jokes is the answer to the old and clumsy aphorism that a poet is born, not made. That answer usually runs that of course a poet is born, naturally—and so is a carpenter; if the little poet had been conjured out of thin air into a magician's hat, then—it would be something to talk about. What we intend to say is that sometimes, very rarely, the lyric gift is born with the poet. And what we want to imply is that good poetry may be written even when a poet lacks the lyric gift; but never, in that case, rememberable poetry. Mr. George Dillon, the greater number of whose published poems have been collected in this volume, "Boy in the Wind," possesses the rare and precious endowment. For the lyric gift, it seems, expresses itself directly through the melodic line of a composition, and by the grace and finish and appeal of that melodic line to the eye or to the ear, the product, be it music, or poetry, or painting, becomes seductive, motionally complete, in a word, memorable. In the same way as a melodic line is perceptible to the ear, when music is played, and to the eye, when the score is read, so, in Mr. Dillon's poems, the lyric current can not only be heard, but is often so palpably felt as to be dimly visible.

Thus, the quality that gives life to lyric utterance Mr. Dillon possesses. If he continues to write poetry as he grows in maturity and experience, I believe he will come into the possession of the quality that gives it permanence. In many of his poems, the added harmony of felicitous wisdom is already present. That

> . . . girls must wander pensive in the spring
> When the green rain is over,
> Doing some slow, inconsequential thing,
> Plucking clover;

is, esthetically considered, profoundly true, and Mr. Dillon is the first to express it in this particular, delicately final, form. His "Toe Ballet" makes an appeal to more than one sense, and many associated experiences. In

> The blue profound stage gleams with narrow girls
> Like moonlight in a cavern. While clear slow
> Waltz-notes ascend from shadowed instruments,
> Their pallid arms precisely float and glow,
>
> Their trembling arched legs lift, their skirts drift wide,
> Their bodies bend like soft-blown flames until
> Like steadied flames they straighten and subside,
> Making a silence ere the strings are still,

I think there can be no fault. When we read, among the last few lines of "Love like Fear," the question

> Who dreamed that love would come like fear?

we hesitate, thinking of Yeats, and wonder if Mr. Dillon is going to be obviously derivative. But, proceeding and finding

> This is that quiet, sick and clear,
> Before a thunderstorm. I hear
> Only my heart beat in the hush
> Ere the wind roar, the rain rush

we discover that the reminiscent line belongs legitimately to a concept that Mr. Dillon has made undeniably his own. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dillon must acknowledge one of Yeats' most effective poetic devices—that of making use of a common phrase, with all the immediacy of its endless vibrating connotations kept intact, yet renewed for poetic use by a slight change, as when the latter transferred the idea of endless tears with the adjective, in writing "the salt eye of man." Since "Boy in the Wind" was published, "Autumn Movement," a poem representing Mr. Dillon's highest achievement as yet, has appeared in the New Republic of November 2. It ends with the lines

> This is my loneliness—in the idle hours
> When autumn and night lean in and I am alone,
> Remembering friends I have had, the girls like flowers
> Remembering the games and dancing done.

The expression "the nights are beginning to draw in," when autumn comes, is a common one. Its adaptation into "when autumn and night lean in" makes an enriched stanza. The change of the verb from "draw" to "lean" is finely evoca-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive, for it tends to personify night as night is apt to become personified to one who, in the misty evenings of the fall of the year, is alone with it.

Otherwise, Mr. Dillon does not in the least derive from Yeats. He is, perhaps, attracted by the neo-metaphysical group; his language makes one think so on many occasions. To confess all, he reminds me, in his simpler utterances, of Arthur Rimbaud, for often then, but not always, he betrays an ability which the great Frenchman possessed in such abundance, the art of evoking a mood with one or two words at the beginning of a poem, which, as it proceeds, is not only maintained, but deepened. Another elusive resemblance lies in the combination of frigid reserve with occasional shy and endearing abandon. It is but honest to say that his level of accomplishment is not equal to Rimbaud's at the same age—that of twenty.

HELEN GOODSPEED.

Sociology: Historical, Applied and Speculative

American Masters of Social Science; An Approach to the Study of the Social Sciences Through a Neglected Field of Biography, by Howard W. Odum, Editor, and Nine Others; New York: Henry Holt and Company. 411 pages. $5.

Social Differentiation, by Cecil Clare North; Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 343 pages. $2.50.

Social Progress, by Ulysses G. Weatherly. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 388 pages. $3.

Social Adjustment, by Robert C. Dexter. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 424 pages. $5.

The Myth of the Individual, by Charles W. Wood. New York: The John Day Company. 297 pages. $2.50.

Teaching the Social Studies, by Edgar Dawson and Others; Teachers' Professional Library. New York: The Macmillan Company. 405 pages. $2.

SOCIOLOGISTS are probably as self-critical as any group of scientists may be expected to be. If one were to listen to their protestations at sociological conferences, it would be easy to believe that each member of the craft had vowed to reform. They fairly grovel in self-abasement concerning their past works and thereupon rededicate themselves to rigorous scientific method—for the future. The very next batch of sociological texts and treatises belies these solemn vows: it gushes forth, a vein of imitative, trebly-digested, textbookish thought suitable (or unsuitable) for the consumption of adolescents.

The fault, as has often been suggested, does not lie wholly with the sociologists; it is, partially at least, a condition which inheres in the phenomena with which the social sciences deal. Any event which may be described as interaction or coaction between two or more human beings is a sociological fact. When another human being, assuming to stand outside the area of such events, attempts to tabulate, correlate, and interpret facts of this character, he is presumably a social scientist. In terms of the current conception of social science, the observer becomes scientific in proportion to his ability to labor in a disinterested, detached fashion and to reduce his data to objective, measurable forms. But this very effort at achieving detachment falsifies social situations; it is even difficult, if not impossible, for the historian who deals only with facts which have already settled into somewhat stabilized patterns. Those historians who possess the courage to cast off this falsifying mask often attain the most clarifying insights. Parrington, in his recent volumes on "Main Currents in American Thought," frankly sets out to tell the story of our evolving ideology from a biased point of view; he tests the contribution to this stream of thought with the liberal's preconceptions; the result is not merely lively reading but a distinct challenge to the "judicial" historians whose biases are operative on subconscious levels, and consequently more dangerous. Social scientists are, if their insights possess validity, participant observers; they cannot succeed in making their observations both true and useful by merely appropriating the methods of the physical sciences; they must go through with the arduous process of creating their own method. In the meantime, the sociological literature of our time will need to be scanned carefully in the search for those creative points of departure which lead the way toward new insights and, ultimately, toward the new method. Out of a large number of sociological accumulations of the past few months, I have selected the following six volumes as being not merely the best but most representative of contemporary currents.

Professors Odum (and his coöperators), Weatherly, Dexter, and Dawson (also with his collaborators) have written texts which are obviously designed for class-room consumption. All four volumes represent a relatively high standard in textbook-writing, and each contains at least one of the clues mentioned in the above introduction. The composite volume by Professor Odum is to be followed by others which, taken together, are to provide us with a personally interpreted American social science. Here we have a hint to the effect that the personalities and careers of individuals—including their wishes and desires—play an important role in the evolution of the sciences which they represent. The sketches of nine representative social scientists are surprisingly uniform in approach, content and treatment, and constitute, for the most part, fascinating reading. But each "master" was given a friendly biographer, and the critical note is all but absent.

Professor Weatherly in "Social Progress" admits that his personal stake in certain aspects of progress has influenced his writing, and he thereupon proceeds to deal with progress, not from the point of view of any stated dogma, but rather as a pragmatist. He is chiefly concerned about what he calls the "dynamics of change." He distrusts both journalistic and philosophic accounts of progress, and proceeds to his task with the tools of the historian and the anthropologist. Unhappily, the psychological thrust of the past decade has not aroused any misgivings in his mind; he falls back upon biological data, which constituted the emphasis in his early training, and consequently, he does not quite achieve a contemporary synthesis. The note of pessimism about which he warns the reader in the preface does not seem to influence his thinking, save when biological factors are under consideration. His social goals, which are, of course, philosophical deductions, despite his disavowals, will please those who like to call themselves liberals. Professor Weatherly wants a society functionally organized, achieving its unity through diversity and striving toward "flexible economic equilibrium" by which a balance is struck between production and its ideals and utilization or use; in addition, the society of his goals, that is, a social organization participating in progress, will also find the means for balancing egoism and sociality, discipline and liberty; it will foster self-respect and self-governing personalities, and will sanction all its ends with the mild benedictions of humanism. This is, patently, a society of the imagination which runs at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right angles to the societies now being created in Fascist Italy and Soviet Russia.

"Social Adjustment" is an orthodox text on social problems, made into a beautifully printed and well organized book. All the old categories are here—feeble-mindedness, sex and the family, health, history of English poor relief—and each is adequately considered. In addition, one category, at least, is given new prominence, namely, the accelerating mobility of modern peoples. There is a note of modernity in Professor Dexter's treatment of sex and the family. "The divorce index," he affirms, "is no indication of the proportion of successful or unsuccessful marriage relationships; it is rather an index of the extent to which society recognizes the existence of intolerable family conditions and provides for their mitigation." He also pleads for something better than the present Volstead Law for dealing with the problem of drunkenness. Indeed, the more one contemplates various positions of Professor Dexter in this volume, the more certain one becomes that this is probably the most liberally written social-problems text available.

The hopeful sign manifested by the above three works is the increasing recognition of the interdependence of the various separated social sciences. Odum's backward look covers nine of the disciplines dealing with human and social affairs, while Weatherly draws heavily upon at least five. Professor Dawson approaches the social sciences from the point of view of an educational technician; he includes eight disciplines (not the same ones incidentally covered in Odum's outline) in his purview, and he asks eight respective educators to tell how each of these sciences should be taught. He proposes to "discuss the possibility of merging the separate purposes of the eight sciences for the achievement of the great general purpose—development of faith in human institutions and human progress." While one might expect the social sciences to be more like the other sciences, namely, capable of destroying faith in existing institutions, this does not deter from giving general approval to so worthy an aim. But this objective is nowhere reached in this volume. The various specialists seem to be dimly aware that there are interrelationships between their sciences and others, but they fail to point out how the combination of two or more disciplines may be utilized by the student who wishes to arrive at integrated insights.

The fact that an intelligent journalist sets out to disprove individuation, at the same time that a professional sociologist publishes a volume on social differentiation, leads to certain reflections concerning American scholarship. This fact may be taken as an anomaly, an indication of the gross unevenness of our learning, or it may be utilized as a symbol of our lively diversity. In any case, it seems wholly clear that Mr. Woods, the journalist, and Professor North, the sociologist, live in two different worlds and breathe the air of two highly divergent intellectual climates. At the outset, it should be noted that these two volumes deserve more attention than can be given in this composite review. "The Myth of the Individual" and "Social Differentiation" are not merely opposite in emphases, but they proceed from antithetical methods. Mr. Woods sees the world through the spectrum of industry, and as the varying colors tend to blend under the heavy impact of economic motives, he sees the emergence of a social whole and the disappearance of the individual. Professor North, on the contrary, uses the method of orthodox scholarship; he has no special thesis, but out of the accumulation of multitudinous researches discovers a new significance for the individual and his differences. Mr. Woods writes journalistic sociology without footnotes and without references, and, alas, without an index. Professor North writes academically, and appends as many as forty-nine references to a single chapter. And the reader can only sigh as he wishes that Mr. Woods knew more about the literature of the human sciences and that Professor North had the faculty of writing lively, readable sentences.

Mr. Woods wants his readers to accept a radical interpretation of the industrial revolution: machines have annihilated individuals. Henceforth we live in a "communistic" world whether we will it or not. In the concrete, realistic world which Mr. Woods inhabits, that is, the world of industrial collaboration, "there is no such thing as an individual." It is a collectivity which drives all our automobiles, and even John D. Rockefeller playing golf is used as a twisted symbol of collectivism. Professor North, a sociologist presumably learned in all of the older doctrines of mystic collectivisms, reacts in exactly the opposite direction. He sees social differentiation, that is, individuals separating themselves from social wholes, as one of the fundamental aspects of human nature and the social process. Because of varying functions, cultures, interests, ages, biological inheritance and psychological dispositions, individual human beings differ; and, because they differ, we are all subject to a procedure known as specialization. After having stated this thesis with commendable precision, Professor North proceeds to demonstrate how it comports with the theory of democracy, for which he obviously holds an emotional affection. Here he falls back upon traditional sociological terminology, and once more speaks of societies and groups as organic entities. And if Mr. Woods could have entirely banished theological terms and categories from his mind, his volume would have certainly stood as a more solid challenge to easy individualistic generalizations. As they stand, these two volumes will need to be read by all who are inclined to speculate over that age-long problem of the one-and-the-many, the individual-and-the-group.

E. C. LINDEMAN.

The Bridge of San Luis Rey

The Bridge of San Luis Rey, by Thornton Wilder. New York: A. and C. Boni. $2.50.

THE bridge of San Luis Rey was in Peru—not in the republic which lies on the two slopes of the Andes, but in a mythical Peru, a country imagined by the author to serve as the admirable background for several characters whose emotions are thoroughly real. One day the bridge collapsed, and five people were hurled into the valley below. A Franciscan, having witnessed the scene, determined to investigate the lives of the five victims. For, he reflected, their death was a pure accident, a judgment of God. If only he could discover the reason for this judgment, he could unfold the operations of providence, justify God's ways to man, and restore theology to its place among the exact sciences.

Brother Juniper's researches—for which he was later burned at the stake—revealed the story of these five characters, and the greater story of La Périchole, that legendary actress who was the friend of one, the mistress of one, and the mother of a third. Such is the framework of a novel which, without pretense to greatness, is perfect in itself. Mr. Wilder's earlier book, "The Cabala," was in some ways more appealing, but it was also open to criticisms; one could point out the derivative elements,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and name the passages which failed of their purpose. In "The Bridge of San Luis Rey," the texture is completely unified; nothing falls short of its mark; nothing exceeds it; and the book as a whole is like some faultless temple erected to a minor deity—perhaps to St. Louis the King, perhaps to Pachacamac, the sun-god of Peru.

M. C.

Illusive Liberty

Religious Liberty, The Great American Illusion, by Albert C. Dieffenbach. New York: William Morrow and Company. 205 pages. $1.50.

AS NEARLY as one can make out from a rather unimportant presentation of a very important subject, Dr. Albert C. Dieffenbach, editor of The Christian Register, believes that Protestantism has proved false to its faith in freedom from external authority and binding credal dogmas. He notes the recent development of a dogmatic Fundamentalism that overlaps denominational barriers and arrogantly attempts to dominate the political state, so that it has virtually become a state Church. The anti-evolution laws passed in certain states are the evidence, and the degradation of democracy is the result. The author's evident aim is to challenge the liberal ministers in various Churches to take up the crusade and lead the Churches to a re-conquest of their lost freedom.

But the book is exasperating. Dr. Dieffenbach calls attention to the fact that only six of the sixty church journals that he reads mention liberty, and then he declares that there have been no changes in the doctrinal standards of these Churches since Calvin, nor any gain in latitude in respect of church authority since the time of Augustine. This is probably true, and it is a cause for serious concern; but it knocks the foundation from his charge that it is the growth of Fundamentalism which has destroyed the golden age of Protestant freedom. There never was such a thing. Fundamentalism has been running true to Protestant tradition, though not to Protestant theory. But we cannot let Dr. Dieffenbach have it both ways.

Quite possibly, it is the growth of liberalism in certain Churches which has evoked the militant activity of Fundamentalism; and, indeed, Dr. Dieffenbach seems to recognize this when he speaks of "great numbers of thoughtful people who are fortified in their resolution to join the growing and irresistible forces that will one day bring the great change." But in another place he shouts in italics, as if some new and unheard-of scourge had suddenly attacked us.

> *In five years they have won control of the Churches with a total membership of more than thirty millions of souls. The Fundamentalists possess the land.*

Probably the disjointed character of the treatment arises from the fact that the author tried to bring together in it material which had appeared in separate articles in different journals—always a fatal task. That such is the case is the most charitable way to account for such a paragraph as this:

> When the weightier matter of the law of liberty gets into the heart of Protestantism all things will follow. The world has just had a witness. America, under the spiritual guidance of its President in 1917, went into the Great War. The object was not earthly power, greater markets, increased lands, nor even fellowship. The object was impersonal and spiritual. It was Jefferson's theory of freedom extended to the universe—"to make the world safe for democracy." The victory, because it was a spiritual victory, is shared today as much by the foes of the field as by the victors, for that is the impartial and sublime way of all things spiritual. The fruits of the Spirit are complete.

The internal evidence would seem to date such an utterance as early 1919. But God help the world if Protestantism ever sets out to make the Churches safe for liberty in any such manner.

PAUL JONES.

"For to Behold This World So Wide—"

A View of Sierra Leone, by F. W. H. Migeod. New York: Brentano's. 339 pages. $4.50.

Life and Laughter 'midst the Cannibals, by Clifford W. Collinson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 284 pages. $5.

Jungle Paths and Inca Ruins, by William M. McGovern. New York: The Century Company. 526 pages. $5.

Timbuctoo, by Leland Hall. New York: Harper and Brothers. 278 pages. $4.

Oasis and Simoon, by Ferdinand Ossendowski. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 294 pages. $3.

Adventures in Arabia, by W. B. Seabrook. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 334 pages. $3.

More Ports—More Happy Places, by Cornelia Stratton Parker. New York: Boni and Liveright. 288 pages. $3.

Two Vagabonds in Albania, by Jan and Cora Gordon. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company. 304 pages. $5.

THOSE to whom reading means escape from the daily plod should find in travel books the next best thing to an actual holiday from a humdrum existence. To such vicarious adventurers, the successful travel-writers are those who can most effectively carry the wistful reader along on the adventure, the voyage of discovery or the scientific expedition which would be his choice of experience. The capacity in the writer to communicate his own enthusiasm or transmit in some degree the special interest of a country or people is a gift as rare as it is precious. Almost every variety of approach to the subject may be found in the group of books here noticed—from the laborious accuracy of F. W. H. Migeod's report on Sierra Leone to the effervescence of Clifford W. Collinson among the cannibals, and for the vicarious voyager who reviews them, the latter account—though frothier than South Sea foam—has an infectious gusto which qualifies the author as a sparkling conductor of such second-hand excursions, where the painstaking document on West African conditions and traditions prepared by Mr. Migeod proves him only a conscientious witness and a valuable guide for those planning an actual trip.

Between the extremes of these two methods are chronicles interesting in a variety of ways. William McGovern's "Jungle Paths and Inca Ruins" combines an extensive contribution to ethnographic and geographic knowledge with human interest, a comedy sense and a contagious personal zest in the adventurous side of such an expedition. His account of a canoe journey to the headwaters of the Amazon is at once genial and scholarly, omitting no detail

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

important to science, yet unpretentious and often playful in tone. Conditions of extreme hardship and frequent danger are described with no claim to special endurance or courage, while a lively and cheerful curiosity transforms minor experiences of discomfort or distaste into salty flavoring for the adventure. The spirit of the successful explorer seems to be a combination of eagerness and happy-go-lucky energy with at least as much emotional as intellectual curiosity, and the records of adventure which reveal these qualities seem to reflect their practical value in literary effectiveness.

Leland Hall's description of several months' residence in Timbuctoo shows sensitive perception and response to beauty, and much sympathetic friendliness towards the native. Such an attitude as his would go far towards overcoming the fear and hatred felt for whites in black countries, and gives the account a pleasant freedom from the subconscious arrogance of many visitors' records.

Ferdinand Ossendowski's "Oasis and Simoon" is hardly more than a collection of reported incidents of mysterious or occult character, with an occasional romantic episode thrown in for heart interest. The final tale has a flash of his old dramatic power—but even as folk-lore the anecdotes are unimportant, and only the author's flair for the fantastic imbues them with transient literary life.

To those less readily transported to remote enthusiasms, we unhesitatingly recommend W. B. Seabrook's "Adventures in Arabia" as a potent vehicle. The author's warm curiosity, eager good will and receptiveness to unfamiliar theories and conditions of life make the book a real revelation of a people and their ways, and leave the reader envious of the spirit as well as the circumstances of his adventure.

If exuberance alone could float the magic carpet, Mrs. Cornelia Stratton Parker's would waft us furthest. Accompanied by her cosmopolitan young, she cavorts across Europe, setting down every expletive emitted when bicycling against the wind, and every depletive of the Parker wardrobe or equipment. Her narrative is as personal as a family letter, and will be as welcome to her many admirers, although she deals out rough treatment to critics of her previous works. To the tepid outsider, the Parker ascent of the Matterhorn is the only episode of conspicuous interest.

Jan and Cora Gordon have made an agreeable record of their wanderings through Albania by adorning the text with pen-and-ink drawings and water-colors which bring the scenes and people vividly before one. The narration is bright, cursive and good-humored, but, unless the reader is already inclined toward Balkan travel, will not lure him irresistibly in that direction. We suspect it to be one of the many books that heighten one's enjoyment when read on the spot, but that has less potency before one's ain fireside. And alas!—cries the petulant voyager-around-a-living-room, shoving the whole pile aside—what book would not!

DOROTHY BACON WOOLSEY.

Contributors

VIRGINIA WOOLF, English novelist and critic, is the author of "Jacob's Room," "Mrs. Dalloway," "To the Lighthouse," and other books.

HELEN GOODSPEED writes verse and reviews for various periodicals.

PAUL JONES, ex-Bishop (Protestant Episcopal) of Utah, is Secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

READ

Liberals and the Class Struggle

by Robert Morss Lovett

A brilliant indictment of Liberalism in THE MODERN QUARTERLY

the one magazine in America that combines radiant scholarship with realism and virility.

Other pentrating Articles are:

Red Love in Soviet Russia, V. F. Calverton; Reflections on the Jazz Age, Harry Elmer Barnes; Is Prostitution Petering Out? Gilbert K. Shaw; The New Sociology, Arthur W. Calhoun; The New Russian Art Expression, Huntly Carter; These Tragic Comedians, S. D. Schmalhausen. (A political Spoon River Anthology.)

Single copy 50c. One year $1.50

THE MODERN QUARTERLY
119 N. High Street,
Baltimore, Md.

You are cordially invited to the Annual Dinner of the
League for Industrial Democracy
Thursday Evening, December 29, 6:30 P. M.
IRVING PLAZA
17 Irving Place, New York City
Subject: POLITICAL PROSPECTS FOR 1928
Speakers: SENATOR GERALD P. NYE, *of North Dakota,* NORMAN HAPGOOD, MAX EASTMAN, NORMAN THOMAS
Chairman: Robert Morss Lovett
Tickets at $2.50 may be obtained at League for Industrial Democracy, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Admission to balcony at 8:30, $1.00. For information regarding Students' Conference of L. I. D. New York City, December 28-30, 1927, write Harry W. Laidler, Executive Director of the L. I. D.

THEATRE

Theatre Guild Acting Co. in Bernard Shaw's Comedy
The Doctor's Dilemma
Mats. this week: Mon. Wed. Thurs. and Sat.
GUILD Th., W. 52d. Evs. 8:20 Mats. Mon. Wed. Thurs. and Sat. 2:20.

THE THEATRE GUILD *presents*
PORGY
Mats. every day this week.
REPUBLIC Th., W. 42d. Evs. 8:40 Mats. Wed. & Sat. 2:40

MAGAZINE

... The FIGURE *in the* CARPET:
A Magazine of Prose

A new magazine devoted exclusively to the study and practice of the art of prose, and directed toward a better understanding of the relation between reader and writer.

Among its contributors are Waldo Frank, Elva de Pue, Alfred Kreymborg, William Troy, Hansell Baugh, and Gorham B. Munson.

Published monthly. Price 25 cents at principal booksellers here and abroad, or at

THE FIGURE IN THE CARPET
465 West 23d St., N. Y. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED